

# Meliora:

A Quarterly Review

OF

# Social Science

IN ITS

Ethical, Economical, Political, and Ameliorative  
Aspects.

VOL. XII.

'VIDEO MELIORA PROBOQUE.'

OVID. METAMORPH., lib. vii. 20.

LONDON :

S. W. PARTRIDGE, 9, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1869.

MANCHESTER PRINTED AT THE GUARDIAN STEAM-PRINTING WORKS, CROSS STREET.

## C O N T E N T S

---

	PAGE
THE BRITISH COLONIES	I
BYEWAYS OF ENGLISH	21
THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN	51
ROBERT FALCONER	61
THE LICENSING LAWS AND PROPOSALS FOR THEIR AMENDMENT	65
SCARLET FEVER AND ITS PREVENTION	84
THE SANITARY MISSION WOMAN	88
PAROCHIAL MISSION WOMAN	89
MR. LECKY'S HISTORY OF EUROPEAN MORALS	97
THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN RELATION TO LABOUR AND CAPITAL	110
BACKWARD GLANCES: ENGLAND IN 1769	123
SOMERSETSHIRE	138
THE GRETTONS OF HIGHFLY	155
DINING HALLS	182
AN ENGLISH PHOTOGRAPH BY AN AMERICAN	184
CIVILIZATION AND HEALTH <sup>2</sup>	193
J. S. MILL ON THE SUBJECTION OF WOMEN	207
REPORT OF CONVOCATION ON INTEMPERANCE	219
DR. LYMAN BEECHER'S SIX SERMONS	238
DANIEL DEFOE	243
AN AUNT'S TALE	261
FIELD SPORTS	289
MODERN TOWN CONVEYANCES	305
REPORTING AND REPORTERS	321
THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS	336
UNDERGROUND LIFE	354
THE STOKER'S REVENGE	372
STATISTICAL DATA FOR SOCIAL REFORMERS	82, 176, 279, 369
NOTICES OF BOOKS	91, 185, 282, 378



# Meliora.

---

## THE BRITISH COLONIES.

1. *The Colonial Office List for 1869.* By Arthur N. Birch and William Robinson, of the Colonial Office. London: Harrison.
2. *Greater Britain : A Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries, during 1866 and 1867.* By Charles Wentworth Dilke. 2 vols. London : Macmillan.
3. *Another England. Life, Living, Homes, and Home Makers in Victoria.* By E. Carton Booth, late Inspector of Settlement to the Government of Victoria. London : Virtue.
4. *The Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III., 1760-1860.* By Thomas Erskine May, C.B. (Chapter xvii.) London : Longman.

THERE is nothing more remarkable in political geography than a map of the world on which all the British possessions are tinted with one colour. The contrast between the extent of territory covered by the British Colonies and the narrow limits of the British Isles,—between the small parent kingdom and the innumerable and often enormous off-shoots is really amazing. The first is comprehended within ten degrees of latitude and as many of longitude, while one alone of the second stretches through thirty degrees of latitude and no fewer than eighty degrees of longitude. The extent of our possessions is equalled by their variety. They are found in every sea, on every continent, within every zone. English names are found, indeed, even beyond the limits of habitable existence. It was the English seaman Parry who all but reached the North pole; and the English seaman Ross who designated Mounts Erebus and Terror in that far distant southern land, which is still all but a *terra incognita*. Between

these extremes lie island settlements, republics, dominions, and an empire, all owning the rule of Queen Victoria nominally, however varied their forms of government really. Englishmen rule the colony of Queensland, which has just completed its first decade. Englishmen rule the empire of Hindostan, where they are brought face to face with a literature five hundred years older than the *Iliad*. England, favoured with one of the most temperate climates in the world, has sent her sons into every kind of climate; has sent them to the frozen waters of Hudson's Bay, to the scarcely varying temperature of New Zealand, to the scorching heat of India. Englishmen find themselves the neighbours of the North-American Indian trapper, of the savage negro on the Western Coast of Africa, of the polished Hindu Brahmin, and the clever Chinese merchant, whose ancestors enjoyed all the arts of civilised life, at the time that the woad-stained Briton offered his sacrifices in the Druids' grove. England's possessions are of every kind, and have every conceivable sort of history. Some were planted for trade, some for the maintenance of naval supremacy. Some were peaceably colonised by adventurous voyagers; some were captured in war, or extorted when making peace. They vary from the barren rock of Gibraltar to the spicy groves and plantations of Ceylon; from the crumbling rabbit-warren of Heligoland to the vast continent of Australia.

Sir Walter Raleigh was the first Englishman who conceived the idea of a great British Colonial empire. The discoveries of Spain fired him with emulation, and something more. It must be confessed that his expeditions will not bear scrutiny. The colonist of Raleigh's time was little better than a pirate. Success alone even in that by no means strict age could justify some of the measures taken by the searchers after El Dorado. Chatham, the other English statesman to whom England is, after Raleigh, most indebted for her colonies, also acquired them mainly by force; but he won them in regular warfare, by the aid of lawfully commissioned ships and enlisted troops; not through the lawless attacks of buccaneers. The first colonists were private companies, which, having obtained royal letters patent, took possession on their own account, appointed their own forms of government and rulers, and were virtually independent of their Sovereign. But this mode of colonisation was absolutely disastrous to the aborigines. So covetous, so cruel were the settlers, that they would have exterminated the original inhabitants speedily and entirely if the Crown had not at last stepped in and declared that these had rights which must be

respected. The colonists themselves found the intervention of the Crown advantageous, since it was a guarantee that they would not be ejected by the next new comer. A colony of a few dozen Englishmen was no match for a French squadron; but the second might be defied with safety when the first knew that the British Government would fight in their behalf. Some of the earliest colonies were indeed founded as a protest against British rule, and these preserved an almost entire independence, until an obstinate King and an unwilling minister made that independence complete. But with these colonies, the United States of to-day, we are not concerned. In the others, in those which still belong to us, not only was the connection with the Crown maintained, but the English constitution was adopted as the type of government. There was a miniature Parliament—with king (represented by the governor), lords (represented by the legislative council), and commons (represented by the legislative assembly). The great distance at which many of the colonies were, made them virtually independent of the Sovereign. They were, in fact, self-governed. In some cases where the Home Government attempted to interfere, resistance, either passive or active, was successfully offered. This was done even in those colonies which were not originally settled by Englishmen, but were obtained by conquest from other nations, and as such were called Crown colonies, and governed more immediately from England. It is only, however, within the last thirty-five years that the present degree of independence has been obtained. For a long period anterior to that, the dominion of the Crown in colonies acquired by conquest or cession was absolute, and the authority of the Colonial Office was exercised directly, by instructions to the governors. In free colonies it was exercised indirectly through the influence of the governors and their councils. Self-government, as Sir Erskine May remarks, was there the theory, but in practice, the governors, aided by dominant interests in the several colonies, continued to govern according to the policy dictated from Downing-street. Just as at home, the Crown, the nobles, and an ascendant party were supreme in the national councils,—so in the colonies, the governors and their official aristocracy were generally able to command the adhesion of the local Legislatures. A more direct interference was often exercised, and constant misunderstandings arose about such subjects as the grants of land to the colonists, the church endowments, official salaries, and patronage. The last was especially the source of strife. Infants in the cradle were appointed to well

paid posts, the duties of which were performed by deputies, and the salaries of which were provided by the colonists, but were for the most part spent out of the colonies. The scandal was intolerable, and the Home Government had to make its first concession by surrendering to the colonial governors all appointments under £200 a year. This was but the beginning of the new régime. It soon became necessary to grant representative institutions; and, these obtained, it was speedily found essential that the governor should be a constitutional ruler, and should dismiss his ministers when they no longer had the confidence of the people. In this way the British colonies became even more democratic than the United States. The president's fixed tenure of office and large executive powers, the independent position and authority of the Senate, and the control of the Supreme Court, are checks upon the democracy of Congress. But in our colonies the majority of the democratic assembly, for the time being, are absolute masters of the Colonial Government; they can overcome the resistance of the legislative council, and dictate conditions to the governor, and, indirectly, to the parent State. Not content with this degree of democracy, the South Australian colonies attempted for a time to rule with only one chamber. This attempt was, however, soon abandoned, and these colonies now have three estates, as the mother country has, the Sovereign being represented by the Governor, and the House of Peers by the Legislative Council, with this important difference, that the Council is an elected body.

Another cause which led to the independence of the colonies was the adoption of free trade by Great Britain. It used to be assumed as a politico-economical axiom that this country ought to encourage and develope its colonies by levying heavy duties on the produce of other countries; while that of the colonies came in duty free, or, at least, subject to a much lighter duty. Viewed strictly, this was really nothing less than taxing the people of England so many millions a year in order that Jamaica sugar growers and Canadian timber merchants might grow rich. At the very time that this was being done, English taxpayers were called upon to bear a still further burden by having to provide for the defence of the colonies. The semi-paupers of Bethnal Green and St. Giles's have been taxed to pay the cost of the wars brought about by the land gluttony of New Zealand settlers, and the wages of the troops who have been idling on the heights of Montreal or within the battlements of Québec. With no power on the part of England to tax the colonies, the colonies have had virtually for many years the power to tax England.

It is true, no doubt, that the colonies, being unwillingly involved in England's quarrels, had a claim upon her for protection. In the 'Trent' business, for instance, the dispute was entirely between the mother country and the United States ; and yet the war, if war there had been, would have been fought on Canadian ground. In that case England was bound to send the aid she did. It is by no means certain that she was bound to pay for it. It might fairly have been argued that this exposure to war was one of the conditions of the arrangement by which the colonies remained united to England ; England being ready to maintain a standing army at her own cost, available for the defence of the colonies, when they required it, only with the understanding that when engaged in the service of the colonies, the colonies should pay for such troops as they required. This, in fact, is the principle which has been for many years in force in India, which has lately been applied to New Zealand, and which the present Government is extending to other colonies. Moreover, it must be remembered that the condition which we have been considering is exceptional. The rule has been that even when there has been no prospect of war, a large force has been maintained in the colonies at the expense of the English taxpayer. The troops so used have really been acting as police, and the first duty of every community, that of keeping order among its own people, has been imposed upon us by the colonies in their own behalf. It is not surprising that among the first reductions effected by a ministry which had for one of the chief subjects of its programme financial reform, should be the military expenditure of Great Britain upon her colonies. The only cause for surprise is that the present system, so grievously unfair to our own population, should have been endured so long. The marvel is all the greater, because the colonies have shown a disposition to take care of themselves at our expense,—a disposition manifested in the protective duties laid upon British produce. On this point we shall presently have to speak more fully.

According to the 'Colonial Office List' for 1869, which of course does not concern itself with India, 'Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions' are forty-eight in number. Of these, three (Gibraltar, Heligoland, and Malta and Gozo) are in Europe ; four (Ceylon, Hong Kong, the Straits Settlements, and Labuan) are in Asia ; eight (Cape of Good Hope, Gambia, Gold Coast, Lagos, Natal, St. Helena, Sierra Leone, and Mauritius) are in Africa ; ten (Bermuda, British Columbia, the two Canadas, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, British Guiana, and the Falk-

land Islands) are reckoned as in America; there are sixteen separate colonies in the West Indies; and under the term Australia are included seven colonies (New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, South Australia, Western Australia, and New Zealand). The population of these colonies is very unequally distributed. Queensland, with an area of 678,600 square miles, more than twice the area of any other colony, has a population of less than 90,000; while Ceylon, with an area of only 24,700 square miles, less than a twenty-fifth of Queensland, has more than two million inhabitants. The two may be taken as extreme instances of the widely different types which prevail in our colonies. Queensland was settled as lately as 1859, has little native population, and is so far an almost purely pastoral colony. Ceylon, on the other hand, came to us by capitulation in 1796, and had been colonised by the Dutch many years prior to that date; its population contains but some 3,000 Europeans (1,500 of them soldiers, and 250 civil officials), to more than two million natives, and the country is covered with plantations and forests. In fact, Queensland is a settlement in the strictest sense of the word, while Ceylon is a colony of the old Roman and present Indian type, where the 'colonists' are, though a mere fraction of the population, rulers over the country and the people.

Extensive as our colonies are, it is only very recently that they have formed a separate department of State. It is true that just a century ago, in 1768, a Secretary of State for the American or Colonial Department was appointed, in addition to the two principal Secretaries of State then existing, but this new office was abolished in 1782, for it was in that year England acknowledged the independence of the late American colonies, and the others scarcely needed a special department of State to administer their affairs. These affairs and those of Ireland were handed over to the Home Secretary. There were only two Secretaries of State for twelve years. In 1794 we were engaged in the unjustifiable war with the French republic, which, as Mr. Cobden has shewn, that State did its utmost to prevent. The struggle was a tremendous one, and it was deemed advisable to appoint a Secretary of State for War. To him, in the year 1801, was assigned the superintendence of the colonies. For rather more than half a century the arrangement continued. By the end of that time the colonies had so increased in importance that they demanded the exclusive attention of the Secretary. This he had been pretty well able to give, because for many years his post as Minister of War had been almost a sinecure. But when

England 'drifted' into the Russian war, it was found absolutely necessary to separate the departments ; so for the first time since we lost our American colonies a Minister sat in the Cabinet to represent colonial interests alone. It was not till four years after this that our infinitely more populous Indian Empire was thought worthy of the same representation. A European war was needed to place the colonies in their proper relation to Parliament, and it required a terrible mutiny to achieve the same result for India. It is consolatory to think that having during the last seventy-five years appointed successively Secretaries of State for War, the Colonies, and India, our next appointment of that kind will be one which England will hail with unmixed satisfaction, one in which, far more than the others, they will be interested, a Secretary of State for Education.

The Colonial Office consists at the present time of the following officers. There is, first, a Secretary of State, Earl Granville ; then there are three under Secretaries of State, one of them, Mr. Monsell, representing the department in Parliament, and liable to removal with a change of Government ; the others, Sir Frederic Rogers and Sir Francis Sandford, being permanent. With these four chief executive officers is associated Mr. Thurston Howard, as legal adviser. The next class on the establishment contains the clerks, arranged in five orders of gradation, from Mr. Gordon Gairdner, the chief clerk, who has been in the service for more than forty-five years, and Mr. Henry Taylor, the poet, first of the senior clerks, who entered the service at the same time as Mr. Gairdner, down to the assistant junior clerks. This list comprises twenty-four names. There are other gentlemen who hold special offices ; and besides these are supplementary clerks, copyists, &c. The total number of officials, from the Secretary of State to the extra office porter, is sixty-eight. The office is divided into departments. The first, presided over by Mr. Gairdner, deals with the domestic and financial arrangements of the Office Commissioners, charters, warrants, receipts, and payments in the colonies, and miscellaneous business. Mr. Henry Taylor, known to the world as the author of 'Philip van Artevelde,' and many other books in verse and prose, presides over the West Indian department ; and Sir George Barrow over the African and Mediterranean department. The others are named the Eastern, the North American and Australian, the Librarian, the Parliamentary, and the Registry departments. These shew the work that is done inside the Colonial Office. But there are many other posts outside the office. Without attempting to enumerate

the host of officials in the colonies themselves, there are eleven Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners, fifteen Emigration Officers, and two Crown Agents for the colonies. It should be added that all the Foreign Consuls appointed by other countries in our colonies come under the cognisance of the Colonial Office.

The oldest but one of our present colonies is the Bermudas. It was acquired by settlement in 1609. Admiral Sir George Somers was shipwrecked there on his way to Virginia. On his report, the Virginia Company claimed the islands, and obtained a grant from James I. in 1612. This company sold their right for £2,000 to an association of 120 persons, who became incorporated as the Bermuda Company in 1616. The extensive powers conferred by their charter were so much abused that it was annulled in 1684, and the colony has since then been governed by the Crown. Early in the present century the importance of the Bermudas as a naval station became apparent, and a dock-yard was established there. Convicts were kept at hard labour on the public works, but the colony was never made a penal settlement, nor were convicts allowed to be discharged there. The establishment was broken up in 1863. One act of the colonists deserves special mention. On the abolition of slavery in 1834, the system of temporary apprenticeship of the emancipated slaves, permitted by the Act of Parliament in the slave-holding colonies, was dispensed with, and the slaves there obtained their freedom six years sooner than the time prescribed by the home Legislature. The sixteen West Indies include three sorts of colonies, single islands such as Antigua and Barbadoes, groups of islands such as the Bahamas and the Virgin Islands, and continental territory such as Honduras in Central America. The importance of these colonies is to be estimated by population rather than area. Honduras, which contains 13,500 square miles, has but 25,635 inhabitants, while Jamaica, with less than half the surface, has over 440,000. These colonies were obtained in three ways: by settlement, by capitulation during war, and by cession according to treaties usually made at the end of a war. In the possession of the two latter class of West Indian colonies we have been preceded chiefly by the Spaniards and the French, but also in one instance, Tobago, by the Dutch. As a rule these colonies cannot be described as prosperous. Jamaica, the chief of them, has long been in a languishing state, the taint of slavery being here particularly hard to eradicate. Both the imports and the exports have fallen off of late years, and the public debt has increased until it now stands at over £788,000. The

most prosperous of the islands is Barbadoes, which, with a population only one-third of that in Jamaica, imports nearly, and exports more than, three times as much as Jamaica. African labourers were long ago introduced into Barbadoes, and seem much more energetic and capable of working than the Jamaica negro. Mr. Trollope, in his *West Indies and the Spanish Main*, has spoken most highly of the condition and prospects of the smaller islands, while of the larger he takes a gloomy view.

Our three European settlements came to us in two instances by capture, in one by cession. Gibraltar was conquered in 1704, and has a total population of about 22,000, whereof 6,600 are military. Of late an animated discussion has been maintained in the newspapers as to the cession of this famous stronghold. It is a significant fact that this discussion was raised first in the columns of a Conservative paper, at that time an organ of the Government. But after a good deal of correspondence, the conclusion seems to be that we are not capable of so much magnanimity as would be required in surrendering this trophy of our military prowess. Its use as a military and naval station has been gravely questioned by the most eminent authorities. The cost of maintaining a garrison there may well be taken into account in these days of retrenchment. We know also that the port is used largely by smugglers for evading the Spanish customs' duties. Some writers have been bold enough to appeal to our sense of justice, and to ask how we should view the occupation of Portland by a Spanish force. But the leading journal has denounced 'sentiment' in politics, that is, so far as the sentiment of other nations is concerned. The same journal does not hesitate to appeal to British sentiment by asking how we could suffer so glorious a memorial of our military achievements to pass from us. The time is not yet come, it seems, for 'the golden rule' to be applied to foreign politics, for nations, as well as individuals, to acknowledge the duty of doing unto others as they would that others should do unto them. Malta, though obtained like Gibraltar, by conquest, is not like Gibraltar, a badge of conquest, nor a perpetual source of humiliation and annoyance. Malta was taken in 1800 from the French, who had captured it two years before. The Maltese enjoy free institutions, and are on the whole well satisfied with our rule. A large number of government posts are held by the native inhabitants, and the commerce which we carry on with the island is an important source of wealth. Heligoland, the smallest of Her Majesty's colonial possessions, being but one-eighth of a square mile in area, was ceded to

us in 1814. It is ruled on much the same principle as Malta. There is an English Governor, and the natives are associated with him in the council. The inhabitants formerly depended solely upon fishing, but since 1830 the island has become a fashionable bathing place. The old seafaring population is rapidly decreasing. The Heligolanders now devote themselves to building and letting lodging-houses, and they live during the winter on the harvest they have gained in the summer. The only article of export is the oyster, but the bank has become so deteriorated from irregular fishing that it has been found necessary to give it rest.

Our Asiatic possessions, exclusive of India, contain about one-fourth of our colonial population. Ceylon we have already mentioned. Hong Kong is one of the islands called by the Portuguese discoverers, Ladrões, from the number of thieves found there. It is separated from China by a strait of only half-a-mile in width, and the opposite peninsula has been ceded to us by Lord Elgin's treaty of 1861, and now forms part of the colony. Hong Kong itself was ceded in 1841, and has been a costly possession. It offers one of the finest harbours and some of the most beautiful scenery in the world. The English and other European merchants grow rich here, and their substantial houses make Victoria a very handsome city. The tonnage has increased from 626,536 in 1859 to 2,562,528 in 1867. The Chinese population, which is about sixty times as large as the European and American, shares in the prosperity. Labuan, like Hong Kong, is an island settlement, and is off the coast of Borneo. It was ceded to us in 1846 by the Sultan of Bruni. It is valuable to us chiefly for its coal, which is much used by vessels trading between China and Singapore. The population in 1867 was of whites (including military and convicts) 45, of coloured 3,783, the men being twice as numerous as the women. Though so small a settlement, it has had two distinguished men among its governors, Sir James Brooke and Sir William Napier. The present governor, Mr. Pope Hennessy, is notorious rather than distinguished. He receives the sufficient allowance of £1,100 a year for ruling a population equal to that of an English village. This same population rejoices also in a bishop. The Straits Settlements, consisting of Singapore, Penang, and Malacca, were transferred from the control of the Indian Government to that of the Colonial Office, April 1, 1867. Singapore is an island at the southern extremity of the Malayan peninsula. Penang is a smaller island off the west coast of the same peninsula. Malacca is on that coast, and consists of a strip of territory 42 miles in

length and from 8 to 24½ in breadth. This last is one of the oldest European settlements in the East, having been taken by the Portuguese in 1511; since then it has been held at intervals by the Dutch and ourselves until 1824, when it was finally ceded to us. Penang was ceded by the rajah of the neighbouring territory in 1786. Singapore was taken possession of by Sir Stamford Raffles in 1819. Formerly these settlements used to be the great entrepôts of commerce in that region. There was subsequently a great decline, yet even now the imports and the exports are each nearly ten millions annually.

Queen Victoria's subjects on the continent of Africa are about 1,200,000 in number. The Cape of Good Hope has nearly half-a-million of these. This name, originally applied to a small promontory, now includes a district comprising 188,286 square miles. The colony has been held in turn by the Portuguese (its discoverers), the Dutch, and ourselves. After having been recaptured and restored to us, it was finally ceded to us by the treaty of 1815. The colony is ruled after the English pattern, and, since the Kaffir wars were stopped, has been fairly prosperous. The adjacent colony of Natal has yet to be developed. Recently, attention has been directed to it by the report of gold discoveries. It does not seem, however, that these are of any importance. Natal is a solitary instance of a colony established by Great Britain without use to the Imperial funds. In its early days it had a loan of £10,000, which has long since been repaid. It was taken possession of about thirty years ago, in consequence of the frequent collisions which occurred between the Cape Government and the Dutch Boers. The Mauritius colony comprises the island of Mauritius (so called after Prince Maurice by the first Dutch settlers), the island of Rodriguez, the Seychelles, and a few other islands. This colony is scattered over a wide area; the Seychelles being 940 miles distant from Mauritius. The last mentioned island was captured by us in 1810, and our possession of it was ratified by the treaty of 1814. Mauritius has obtained a sad prominence lately by reason of the fever, which has destroyed a large portion of the population, and which even now is scourging the island. The colony is important to us, as it forms a port of refuge to our ships trading from India to England round the Cape. The population is about 327,000. Our oldest African settlement is Gambia, which came into our possession in 1631. Gambia, Sierra Leone, Cape Coast Castle, and Lagos constitute the group called the West-African settlements. Sierra Leone is the

most important of the four settlements, and is the central seat of government. Each settlement has a legislative council. Originally, the older settlements were established to carry on the slave trade. They are now held to prevent that trade. Under these circumstances it is the more worthy of mention that the civil war in the United States, which led to the abolition of slavery there, has led to the increased cultivation of cotton in the West-African settlements. Besides cotton we derive from them ivory and palm-oil. St. Helena has the same history as most of our African colonies. It was discovered by the Portuguese, colonised by the Dutch, and taken from them by ourselves. It is little more than a port of call, where vessels may water and take fresh provisions, on their way between England and India. We need scarcely remind our readers that it derives its chief celebrity from the fact that it was for six years the prison of the first Napoleon.

Our American possessions are the largest in the world. They stretch from the borders of the United States far into the frigid zone. It is impossible to form any approximate idea of the area. The greater portion, however, is wholly uninhabitable, and even less useful to us than Alaska was to the Russians. The total number of our American subjects is under four millions, albeit they are spread over the whole land from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The oldest of all our colonies is Newfoundland. It is the only one which dates back to the sixteenth century. Raleigh attempted to colonise it, but in vain. Lord Baltimore was more successful. In spite of its age, it was the last of our North American colonies to receive a responsible government. This was granted so recently as 1855. During the last two years an attempt has been made to induce Newfoundland to enter the confederation. This and the adjacent Prince Edward Island still held aloof until a month ago. The papers of March 8th announced that Newfoundland had decided by a large majority to join the confederation, and no doubt Prince Edward Island will adopt the same course. Up to a very late period they were encouraged in their resistance by Nova Scotia; but a post having been found for the clever leader of the Nova Scotian opponents to confederation, he has become converted to the scheme, the opposition has collapsed, and it is now probable that all the British provinces from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Island of Newfoundland to Vancouver Island, will form one enormous association, with power to use the troops of any one in the defence of any other province, and with power to combine for the construction of great public works in

which all are interested. The scheme is at least grand; whether it will prove capable of realisation is doubted by many persons. For instance, it is doubted if the sparsely populated British colonies could successfully defend themselves against an invasion by the United States, and whether they will ever do more than talk of that project, long dreamt of, a line of railway which would unite the two oceans and cause the trade of China to pass through British America on its way to England. On the other hand, their neighbours are realising their own project with the most marvellous rapidity. The railway which will join New York and San Francisco is being laid down at the rate of three or four miles a day, and will be finished in less than a year from this time. There are other considerations which render it questionable if our American colonies would not be more prosperously ruled from Washington than from London. Hitherto the Canadians, especially, have shewn themselves greatly averse from such a transference of sovereignty. They have professed to fear the burden of taxation which would be laid upon them by annexation. On the other hand, it is likely that they would receive more than an equivalent in the stimulus which would be given to trade and public works. England has done nothing for these colonies but keep troops there; and when these are withdrawn we must expect to see a considerable diminution of the 'loyalty' which has hitherto been expressive enough in words, but in deeds has shewn itself by the taxing of English imports. It is a notable circumstance, one which certainly does not speak much for the prosperity of our American colonies, that by far the larger number of British emigrants to America choose the United States, with their heavy taxation, in preference to the 'dominion of Canada,' with its light taxation and close relationship to the mother country.

We come to the last and most important group of colonies, those which we may, for the sake of convenience, compress under the name Australasia, a term, however, unknown at the antipodes, and not used in the Colonial Office List. There are seven of these colonies, with a total population of 1,600,000. The oldest is New South Wales, on the eastern coast of the Australian continent. It was discovered by the Spaniards in 1609, explored by Captain Cook in 1770, and settled in 1789. Until 1851 it included the district then separated from it and formed into a separate colony under the name of Victoria. Tasmania, discovered in 1642 by Tasman, was made an English penal settlement in 1803, and continued so until 1853. Western Australia was settled in 1829, and has been as unsuccessful as Victoria has been successful.

With a fine climate and fertile soil, its population, after forty years' colonisation, is under 19,000, while that of Victoria is about 630,000. South Australia was settled in 1836 by emigrants sent out under the auspices of the South Australian Colonisation Association. The lands were granted by the Government to this company on the conditions that they should be sold at not less than £1 per acre, and that the revenue arising from the sale should be appropriated to the emigration of agricultural labourers. In the last nine years the combined exports and imports of this colony have doubled. New Zealand was explored by Tasman and Cook, and was settled in 1814, but no colonisation took place until 1839. The combined exports and imports have increased from £801,000 in 1853 to about £10,000,000 in 1867.

Concerning these antipodean colonies two books of great interest have lately been published. One is, 'Greater Britain,' by Mr. Charles Wentworth Dilke, who in 1866 and 1867 supplemented his university education by a tour round the world. The other is, 'Another England,' by Mr. Carton Booth, who for some years held a post under the Victoria Government. Mr. Dilke's volumes are one of the best books of travel published for many years, and they shew an acuteness of observation and originality of thought not often found in a man on the sunny side of five and twenty. Traversing first the North American continent, then touching the Mexican coast, he travelled by the Panama route to New Zealand. His estimate of this 'England of the Pacific,' as it has been called, is not very high. He doubts greatly if the title will ever be fairly earned. At present there is great rivalry between the different provinces, and even between the different towns. He found a want of energy on the part of the colonists. Business that would be transacted in England in a day, takes a week at the antipodes. The Maori struggle, again and again renewed, has been a great drain upon the resources of the colony, and is likely to continue so for some time longer, according to present appearances. But Mr. Dilke has no doubt that the native race will, as in most other instances, give place to the colonists. He was especially struck by the absence of anything like solidarity between New Zealand and the Australian colonies. He says:—

'Australasia is a term much used at home to express the whole of our antipodean possessions; in the colonies themselves the name is almost unknown, or, if used, is meant to embrace Australia and Tasmania, not Australia and New Zealand. The only reference to New Zealand, except in the way of foreign news, that I ever found in an Australian newspaper was a congratulatory paragraph on the amount of the New Zealand debt; the only allusion to Australia that I detected in the

Wellington *Independent* was in a glance at the future of the colony, in which the editor predicted the advent of a time when New Zealand would be a naval nation, and her fleet engaged in bombarding Melbourne, or levying contributions upon Sydney.'—Greater Britain, vol. ii., p. 4.

Mr. Dilke goes on to shew that, politically, there is little in common between the two countries, for, while New South Wales and Victoria are mainly democratic, New Zealand is essentially aristocratic. Moreover, the distance between them is too great for them to be considered as, in any sense, one. New Zealand and Australia are as completely separated from each other as Great Britain and Massachusetts. The distance between the two nearest points of land is greater than that between London and Algiers. From Wellington to Sydney, the nearest port, is as far as from Manchester to Iceland, or from Africa to Brazil. The sea that lies between the two countries is not like the Central or North Pacific, bridged with islands, ruffled with trade winds, or overspread with a calm that permits the presence of light-draught paddle steamers. It is cold, bottomless, without islands, torn by antarctic currents, swept by polar gales, and traversed in all weathers by a mountainous swell. In climate, ethnography, soil, and physical configuration, the countries are entirely unlike. Nor is it only the native races that differ. The Australian colonist is all energy, in spite of his tropical climate. The New Zealand colonist is all torpor, in spite of his equable climate. After this it seems somewhat contradictory to say, as Mr. Dilke does, that while the second is physically the perfection of the English race, 'burly, bearded, strapping,' the first gives greater promise of intellect, and claims to be the ancient Greek revived. Torpor and indolence are not usually the accompaniments of physical strength. If there are differences thus important between the Australians and the New Zealanders, there are others scarcely less so between the various sections of the Australians. The history of the colonies explains these differences. New South Wales, as we have seen, was born in 1788, Queensland in 1859, and they stand side by side upon the map and have a common frontier of 700 miles. The New South Welsh cast jealous glances towards the more recently founded States. It was long before they would consent to the separation of Victoria from their colony, and for some time the gold diggings of Bendigo and Ballarat had to pay tribute for the benefit of the townsfolk of Sydney. Since the separation, Victoria has become the most flourishing colony in the world. The progress of Queensland is not likely to be so rapid. The climate is different, the products are different. Victoria exports gold, Queensland spices.

Victoria is likely to become a country of large cities. Queensland is not likely to be anything else than a pastoral and agricultural country. Queensland is exposed to a special danger from the fact that in the sugar and cotton culture coloured labour is now almost exclusively employed, with the usual effect of degrading field-work in the eyes of European settlers and of fixing upon the country an aristocratic type of society. Mr. Dilke prophesies that if the neighbouring colonies do not interfere to prevent the importation of dark-skinned labourers into Queensland, as they interfered to prevent the importation of criminals into West Australia, a few years will see Queensland a wealthy cotton and sugar growing country, with all the vices of a slave-holding government, though without the name of slavery. The planters will govern Queensland and render union with the free colonies impossible, unless great gold discoveries take place to save the country to Australia. He adds :—

'Such is the present rapidity of the growth and rise to power of tropical Queensland, such the apparent poverty of New South Wales, that were the question merely one between the Sydney wheat growers and the cotton planters of Brisbane and Rockhampton, the sub-tropical settlers would be as certain of the foremost position in any future confederation as they were in America when the struggle lay only between the Carolinas and New England. As it is, just as America was first saved by the coal of Pennsylvania and Ohio, Australia will be saved by the coal of New South Wales. Queensland possesses some small stores of coal, but the vast preponderance of acreage of the great power of the future lies in New South Wales.'—Greater Britain, vol. ii., p. 17.

Coal is far better than gold. Gold will produce the more rapid results, but coal the more lasting. Moreover, the gold discoveries of Victoria, wonderfully as they have changed the face of that colony, were attended with a terrible amount of misery and an appalling amount of wickedness. The first effect of these discoveries was the invasion of the colony by hundreds of ticket-of-leave and conditionally-pardoned men. They numbered in their ranks (says Mr. Booth) men who had committed every mentionable and unmentionable crime with which the earth has been cursed. They were a terror to all around. Murders were of nightly occurrence. The police were powerless, were indeed hopelessly corrupt, and connived at the crimes which they were sent to repress. Government officials were equally depraved. The successful diggers returning to Melbourne, made that city the high place of debauchery. Other evils followed. The sudden immigration of so many persons led to rash and speculative over-trading. English merchants were told that they might send out anything to Australia, and following that advice they exported so largely that their goods became unsaleable. The fame of the

gold diggings allured emigrants as little wanted as the goods. Those who could do nothing at home went out with the idea that gold was to be picked up by merely stooping for it. Too often, useless men who had never handled pick or spade, broken down doctors, briefless barristers, unsuccessful literary men, their wives and children with them, added to the population of paupers thus suddenly concentrated in Melbourne. The Government did what it could for them, erected tents for them to take shelter in, and thus while the splendid city of Melbourne was rising day by day with the rapidity of a fairy town, though with none of its unsubstantiality—while Melbourne shopkeepers were becoming merchants, Melbourne merchants princes—there was, close by, ‘Canvas Town,’ a town of tents, containing as much hopeless poverty as was to be found in any part of the world. Even those who prospered gave themselves up to dissipation, and four out of every five children died before reaching two years of age. At length the crisis came. The mad rush of 1853 was followed by the terrible collapse of 1854. A letter written in the December of that year by a Melbourne merchant stated that everybody had either failed, or was about to do so. ‘Reckless trading and bad government,’ says Mr. Booth, ‘had in one short twelve-month reduced the country from a state of unexampled prosperity and riches to one of insolvency and rebellion.’ A rebellion was caused by the license fees demanded by the Government from all diggers. This demand led to an armed conflict between the diggers and the military sent out to enforce payment. The result was that the Government had to give way. All the time that the old colonists and the new immigrants were thus hastening to be rich, and in many cases drowning themselves in perdition, one of the most important sources of wealth was culpably neglected. The land was in the hands of a few squatters. They held nearly the whole of the best soil of the colony, and paid for it a rental of only £20,000. In 1867 one-third of the lands produced a revenue of £175,000. The squatters profited little by their covetousness. Insisting that the soil was good only for pastoral purposes, they occupied enormous tracts with a few sheep and cattle. It was in 1860 that the colonial democracy of Melbourne first shewed a due appreciation of this state of things. In Victoria, and also in New South Wales, act after act was passed to encourage agricultural settlers on freehold tenure, at the expense of the pastoral squatters. In the latter colony, the settler may buy a patch of land in the midst of a squatter’s run if he commences to cultivate it at once. The squatting license system ends entirely

this year ; consequently, amid much grumbling, the squatters have been purchasing the land which they once annexed. The first result of the new system has been that Victoria has ceased to be a wheat-importing, and has become a wheat-exporting country. Another result is, that the term squatter is passing through a rapid change of meaning. In 1837 the squatters were defined by the Chief Justice of New South Wales as people occupying lands without legal title, and subject to a fine on discovery. They were described as living by bartering rum with convicts for stolen goods, and as being themselves invariably convicts or expirees. ‘Escaping suddenly from these low associations,’ says Mr. Dilke, ‘the word came to be applied to graziers who drove their flocks into an unsettled interior, and thence to those of them who received leases from the Crown of pastoral land.’ The squatter is now the nabob of Melbourne and Sydney ; the inexhaustible mine of wealth. He patronises balls, promenades, concerts, and flower-shows ; he is the mainstay of the great clubs, the joy of the shopkeepers, the good angel of the hotels ; without him the opera could not be kept up, and the jockey club would die a natural death. His period of all but supreme sovereignty is come to an end ; yet he will no doubt continue to make squatting in the modern meaning of the word as profitable as it was in its original sense.

There is one subject in which we are no less interested than the colonists. It is one which is likely to become more prominent every year, and to lead to important results. We mean protection. We have already seen that protection in one form was the means originally adopted to foster our colonies, and attach them to the mother country. Protection in another form is doing more than anything else to detach them. Of old we taxed the imports of other nations heavily, in order that colonial imports might have the advantage over them in our markets. That system has long been abandoned, on the ground that we have no right to tax the English multitude for the sake of the few colonists. It has been abandoned also in the full belief that a perfectly free market is best for consumers and producers ; yet the colonists have lately taken to laying almost prohibitory duties on British imports. Their return for the help we give them in the shape of British troops, is the discouragement of British trade to their ports. And this is done not by one colony only. It is done in Canada as well as in Australia. It is done, too, in a country which of all others we might have expected to find the home of free trade, the United States. It is done not ignorantly, not through any lingering belief in

the old politico-economical fallacy that the producer, not the consumer, pays the duty; the Englishman, not the colonist. How has this change come about? How is it that in these days, when the doctrine of free trade is taken by us so entirely for granted that we have not the patience to argue the matter, the colonists, who are every bit as enlightened as ourselves, are eager Protectionists? Mr. Dilke tells us that in the Lower House of the Victorian Legislature the free traders formed but three-elevenths of the assembly, and in New South Wales the pastoral tenants are the only supporters of free trade. He tells us that he found colonial shopkeepers exhorting, by advertisement, their customers to 'shew their patriotism, and buy colonial goods;' and that whereas in England unscrupulous traders write, 'From Paris,' over their English goods, in Victoria they write, 'Warranted colonial made,' over imported wares; for many will pay a higher price for a colonial product, confessedly not more than equal to foreign, such is the rage for native industry; such the hatred of the 'antipodean doctrine of free trade.' Shew to the colonists that their doctrine involves them in pecuniary loss, and they will admit it; but they are ready to incur it in order that they may help to build up the colony. Moreover, they believe that though there is a loss on that and similar transactions, protection brings them a profit in the long run. It checks immigration. Wages being 5s. a day in Victoria and 3s. in England, workmen would naturally flock into Victoria until wages fall to 3s. 6d. or 4s. Here comes in protection, and by increasing the cost of living in Victoria, and cutting into the Australian handicraftsman's margin of luxuries, diminishes the temptation to immigration, and, consequently, the influx itself. It might be argued that there is small advantage in maintaining high wages, if money will purchase fewer commodities than in England. In Western America the farmers, who in most countries are the protectionists, while in Australia they are the free traders, admit that free trade would lead to the more rapid populating of their country; but that, they say, is just what they would prevent. They would rather pay a heavy tax in the increased price of everything they consume, or in the greater cost of labour, than see their country denationalised by a rush of Irish or Germans, or their political institutions endangered by a still further increase in the size and power of New York. One old American remarked to Mr. Dilke, 'I don't want the Americans in 1900 to be two hundred millions, but I want them to be happy.' Without protection, it is contended, the United States would have no

manufactures, would be a purely agricultural country in the interior, with a few large cities on the coast. Moreover, the protectionists wish to be defended from the pauper labour of England. They look forward to the time when, having passed through the state of pupilage, their manufactures will no longer require protection—when, local centres being everywhere established, customs will be abolished on every side, and mankind form one family. Time passes quickly in the United States, at all events, and though in 1866 Mr. Dilke found so little variety of opinion as to the advantages of protection, there has within the last few months commenced a strong reaction against it, thanks to the vigorous exposure of the mischief and loss it has occasioned, made by that eminent American financier, Mr. Wells.

We have but very little space for what a preacher would call the practical application of these remarks. The colonies, from the Englishman's point of view, are simply so many countries whither he may betake himself to make the fortune which he has failed to make at home. Or, if he take a larger or less selfish view of them, they are countries on which to discharge the pauper population of England. To a certain extent this latter theory is true. Malthus said truly enough forty-two years ago that 'a comparatively small excess of labour occasions a deterioration of the condition of the labourers in the particular district where such excess exists; or, supposing the excess to be general, the consequences are equally general; and so is the consequent improvement of the whole body of labourers by the abstraction and removal of any superabundant portion.' Mr. Mill has recently declared that 'the exportation of labourers and capital from a place where the productive power is less to a place where it is greater, increases by so much the aggregate produce of the labour and the capital of the world. It adds to the joint wealth of the old and of the new country what amounts in a short period to many times the cost of the transport. There needs be no hesitation in affirming that colonisation in the present state of the world is the very best affair of business in which the capital of an old and wealthy country can possibly engage.' Both Mill and Malthus have well spoken; but their dicta must be accepted with a qualification. Surplus labour can be best disposed of by taking it to the country where it is wanted; but then it must be labour. At the present time we are falling into the serious mistake of supposing that pauperism is in itself a qualification for emigration; in other words, that failure in the old country is a guarantee of success in the new. The emigration-aid societies in the East End of London,

excellently well-intentioned though they be, are likely to give rise to much disappointment and sorrow, unless they bear in mind that it is more difficult for the idle or the incapable man to live in the colonies than in England, simply because prices are higher in the first than in the second. The blind, unreasoning longing to get rid of our paupers through emigration, will give rise to serious consequences, such as resulted fifteen years ago from the longing to get rid of our criminals. When the Home Government disallowed the Australian 'Convict Prevention Bill,' large sums of money were subscribed in Victoria for the purpose of paying the passage of convicted Australian bushrangers and convicts to England, so that the mother country might have a taste of the evils she was inflicting upon her daughters. It is to be hoped that no failure on our part to deal with the great problem of pauperism will force Victorians to transmit to us cargoes of Australian beggars. The selection of English emigrants must be made with judgment. Mere poverty must not be considered a qualification. There must be an honest desire to win a livelihood and a certain amount of capacity to win it, if emigration is not to be as lamentable a mistake as transportation. We sincerely rejoice to see an announcement made while these pages are in course of writing that the Victorian Government has instructed its agent in this country to select a large number of suitable emigrants, who are to be sent to Melbourne as promptly as possible. The selection being made by a responsible representation of the colonists, any blunders that may be made cannot be charged upon us. There is every reason to believe that they will be altogether prevented.

---

## BYEWAYS OF ENGLISH.

BYRON speaks of 'Words which are things;' they are at least the instruments and signs of that knowledge which is power. Our ideas and our wants, our personal and national history, our morals and manners, our prevalent forms of thought, and our predominant associations of ideas are all blended with and intertextured in our words. Words contain within them many important and valuable lessons, and to a few of these, gathered in the by-ways of English speech, we would now direct the attention of our readers.

Words are diaphanous, they show the mental state of the

speaker as well as convey a certain meaning in themselves. Pure speech is in itself no slight evidence of a pure spirit, and a slangy style naturally suggests that its employer leads a slangy life. The use of language is very much influenced by the activity of the associative faculties, and he who in ordinary discourse makes much use of the lexicon of 'fast' life as expressive of his common sentiments, feelings, and goings, suggests that the associations which rule in his habitual thoughts and inner life are of a 'fast' sort, or are, at least, allowed to range unguardedly in that direction. Language thus becomes a sort of barometer of individual and social life, showing the rise and fall of the nature of man towards good and evil—an outward indicator of that which is most inward and concealed. Hence, the moral value of an examination of the lower strata of conversational speech. It has been truly said that 'some very curious results are deducible from such a process, and we doubt whether it is possible to find a department of literature so new or so promising as regards the information which it is likely to afford us, not only on obsolete facts and conceptions, but on the actual world around us, on which, until we know its secret language, our judgment is at fault, and our speculations are fallacious.' Some of these results we hope to point out in the progress of our paper.

George Chapman, who not only glorified our English tongue with a version of Homer, but added to the poetry of Elizabeth's time (and of all time) many beautiful pieces and several semi-classical dramas, and was moreover 'a person of most reverend aspect, religious, and temperate, qualities rarely meeting in a poet,' saw the evil of using euphemistical terms. 'Honesty,' he says, in *The Widow's Tears* (I. i.), 'is stripped out of his true substance into verbal nicety. Common sinners startle at common terms, and they must, by whole mountains, swallow down the deeds of darkness; a poor mite of a familiar word makes them turn up the white o' the eye.' 'Language is the amber in which a thousand precious and subtle thoughts have been safely embedded and preserved. It has arrested ten thousand lightning flashes of genius, which, unless thus fixed and arrested, might have been as bright, but would also have been as quickly passing and perishing as the lightning.' But it is also, it is sad to state, most truly likenable to a precious stone in which there are many flaws imbedded, and if it has preserved and immortalised 'to a life beyond life' much that is good and brilliant, it has also caught up and absorbed much that is tainted with evil, and so has given to what might otherwise have been

fleeting and evanescent, a perpetuity of influence which such evil would not otherwise have had, had it been, even though thought, unspoken.

There is an art of words by which men represent ‘that which is good in the likeness of evil, and evil in the likeness of good, and augment or diminish the apparent greatness of good and evil.’ Hence, ‘words are wise men’s counters, they do but reckon by them, but they are the money of fools.’ The former know that their value is only representative, and requires comparison with the truth of things; the latter accept them as intrinsically valuable, and as giving in themselves the measure of truth. ‘The use of words,’ says the philosopher of Malmesbury, ‘is to register to ourselves and make manifest to others the thoughts and conceptions of our minds;’ ‘for it is evident enough that words have no effect but on those that understand them, and then they have no other use but to signify the intentions or passions of them that speak, and thereby produce hope, fear, or other passions or conceptions in the hearer.’ Hence, ‘it is custom that gives words their force,’ registrative force to ourselves and representative force to others. To know the customs of men in regard to their use of language is to have a gauge of their moral nature, for ‘out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh.’ The language of literature is, in general, guarded and chosen, and is commonly selected for a given purpose; but the language of ordinary conversation, as it is for the most part extempore and demands sudden utterance, supplies a far more correct index of the underlying moral nature of man than the language of letters. Conversational speech shows the most usual and readiest associations of our thoughts, and the turns we give to the topics of talk not unfrequently reveal the hidden operations of the mind to acute observers. ‘The secret thoughts of a man run over all things holy, profane, clean, obscene, grave, and light,’ and these thoughts must register themselves with more or less accuracy and frequency in words. The more frequently and readily our thoughts and our words get associated, the greater the aptitude of these thoughts to suggest these words, and of these words to suggest these thoughts interchangeably, and thus our handiest vocabulary will be that which expresses our most habitual, though our most anxiously hidden thoughts. The train of thought in the latencies of mind is unguided and undesigned or aimless, unless in those who have learned self-control. In the hours of wayward unguardedness the ideas most frequently before the mind are those suggested by our prevailing passions, dispositions, and desires, and the words

in which they register themselves, or with which they connect themselves, must become those most readily available when we wish, or are called upon to speak, and, therefore, must reveal the inner operations of our mental nature. Hence, morally, Buffon was not far off the mark when he said, ‘the style is the man.’

So deeply ingrained and so prevalent is the habit of perverting language and employing it in other than those honest and forthright ways in which it ought to be used, that special names have been appropriated to the different forms it takes, and in some instances the rhetoricians have incorporated the proper management of this art of speech in their treatment of tropes and figures, and have devoted no little care to the explanation of the means of so employing words as to heighten their effectiveness according to the purpose the speaker or writer may have in view. Some of those methods of concealing the precise meaning of the speaker, or of shutting off the attention of the spirit from the moral considerations which ought to arise in men’s minds when considering things and actions, have scarcely attained a place in literature, and, indeed, are sedulously kept out of books, parlour conversation, and general discourse as vulgar and unseemly. To two classes of each of these we intend to devote a little attention, in order that we may endeavour to derive from the facts and instances brought under notice some lessons of value regarding the moral relations of the language of men to the great questions of social science which are engaging the attention of the earnest men of this age anxious to promote and encourage personal reform and moral improvement.

The two literary forms of speech are named respectively Euphuism and Euphemism, and the two unliterary forms are Cant and Slang. On each of these we shall venture to make a few brief remarks.

Euphuism is a word with a history. Though originally derived from the Greek Εὐφυής, which signifies well-shaped, docile, or witty, we owe its introduction and use to an author whose fame has almost fallen out of memory except among literary antiquarians, and to a work which, first published in 1579, about the middle of Queen Elizabeth’s reign, ‘passed through ten editions in fifty-six years, and then was not reprinted’ till October, 1868, when it was issued as one of the excellent series of ‘English Reprints,’ edited by Edward Arber, in a cheap, handy form. That author was ‘the witty, comical, facetiously-quick, and unparalleled John Lyly,’ Master of Arts of both Universities, and the book was ‘Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit;’ a very clever work upon

friendship, love, education, and religion. When Thomas Watson, in 1582, published his 'Passionate Century of Love,' it had prefixed to it a letter from 'John Lly to the author, his friend.' Blount affirms that 'our nation are in his debt for a new English, which he taught them. Euphues and his England begun first that language; all our ladies were then his scholars, and that beauty in a court which could not parley *Euphuisme*, was as little regarded as she which now there speaks not French.' For a century and a-half, at least, Euphues was a name to which not one in twenty thousand could attach a clear idea. All that most people know about its author and his work is probably derived from Sir Walter Scott's vile travesty of euphuism in the person of Sir Shafton Percie, whose insipid nonsense disfigures the 'Monastery'; or from stray panegyrics or denunciations penned, it may be, by those who know only at second-hand that which they praise or condemn. They may, perhaps, have further heard that the alliterative and florid nonsense in 'Love's Labour Lost' is designed to ridicule the alliterative and florid Lly. But all these facts and much more put together will not give so clear an idea of euphuism as the perusal of a few pages of the veritable 'Euphues.' Lly was imitated by Greene, Lodge, and Nash. Ben Jonson caricatured his style in Fastidious Brisk, one of the characters in 'Every Man in his Humour.' Webbe, Meres, and Drayton praised him, and Shakespeare himself owes not a little of his grace of speech to this stylist of Elizabeth's time. Lly and Ascham much improved the English tongue, and Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorickē* directed attention to artistic writing. Lly was also a dramatist of some popularity, although in these as well as in his prose writings the affected sententiousness, the forced antithesis, and the strained smartness read strange to modern ears. Our readers may perhaps like a specimen or two, culled to show that he could speak wise words:—

'Canst thou then be so unwise to swallow the bait which will breed thy bane? to swill the drink that will expire thy date?' P. 77.

'Doth not wine, if it be immoderately taken, kill the stomach, inflame the liver, mischiefe the dronken?' P. 100.

'Learn from Romulus to abstaine from wine, be it never so delicate.' P. 110.  
'Lycurgus set it down for a lawe that where men were commonly dronken the vynes shoulde bee destroyed.' P. 422.

'Let us not omitte that which our auncestours were wont precisely to keepe, that men should either be sober or drinke lyttle wine, that would have sober and discreet children, for that the fact of the father would be figured in the infant. Diogenes, therefore, seeing a young man either overcome with drinke or bereaved of his wittes, cryed with a loude voice, Youth, youth, thou hadst a dronken father.' P. 126.

'If the father counsaile the sonne to refrayne wine as most unwholesome, and

drinke himselfe immoderately, doth hee not as well reprove his owne folly as rebuke his sonnes?' P. 151. 'When the father exhorteth the sonne to sobrietie, the flatterer provoketh him to wine; when the father warneth them to continence, the flatterer allureth him to lust; when the father admonisheth them to thrifte, the flatterer haleth them to prodigalitie; when the father incourageth them to labour, the flatterer layeth a cushion under his elbowe, to sleepe, bidding him to eate, drinke, and to be merry, for that the lyfe of man is soon gone, and but as a short shaddowe, and seeing that we have but a while to lyve, who would lyve like a servaunt? They say that now their fathers be olde and doate through age like Saturnius.' P. 149. 'For you well know, that wine to a young blood, is in the spring time flax to fire, and at all times either unwholesome or superfluous and so dangerous that more perish by a surfeit than the sword. I have hearde wise clearkes say, that Galen being asked what dyet he used that he lyved so long, answered: I have dronke no wine, I have touched no woman, I have kept myselfe warme.' P. 275. 'If thou desire to be olde, beware of too much wine.' 'Long quaffing maketh a short lyfe.' P. 229. 'Let not every inne and alehouse in Athens be as it were your chamber, frequent not those ordinary tables where either for the desire of delicate eates or the meetinge of youthefull companions yee both spend your money vainely and your time idly, imitate him in lyfe whome ye seeme to honour for his learning—Aristotle—who was never seen in the company of those that idly bestowed their time.' P. 152.

Euphemism means, literally, speaking well, having good sense enough to employ words of fair omen, and to avoid unlucky expressions; but in a literary sense it signifies a way of describing an offensive thing by an inoffensive expression. Euphemism is a delicate way of saying what might otherwise offend, and is employed to conceal the precise meaning when anything disagreeable requires to be spoken of: *e.g.*, a face bloated by intemperance is thus delicately hinted at by Aken-side:—

I see Anacreon laugh and sing;  
His silver tresses breathe perfume;  
His cheeks display a second spring  
Of roses taught by wine to bloom.

That was a very good instance of euphemism which an abstinent athlete gave utterance to on accepting a silver cup as a reward for his being swift of foot:—'Gentlemen, I have won this cup by the use of my legs; I trust I may never lose the use of my legs by the use of this cup.' 'To go out for a day's enjoyment' is often a euphemism for 'going on the spree,' or (to speak plainly) to go to get drunk. 'Festive season,' 'Saint Monday,' 'merrymaking,' &c., are often mere euphemisms for 'occasions for drinking.'

Slang is that evanescent vulgar language, ever changing with fashion and taste, which has principally come into vogue during the last seventy or eighty years, spoken by persons in every grade of life, rich and poor, honest and dishonest. It includes 'those burlesque phrases, quaint allusions, and nicknames for persons, things, and places, which from long uninterrupted usage are made classical by prescription.' It is indulged in from a desire to appear familiar with life, gaiety,

town humour, and with the transient nicknames and street jokes of the day. ‘Slang’ is defined by the compiler of Hotten’s Dictionary of Modern Slang, Cant, and Vulgar Words, as being ‘the language of street humour, of fast, high, and low life.’ ‘In its usual Signification,’ says a writer in *Chambers’ Encyclopaedia*, ‘it denotes a burlesque style of conversational language, originally found only among the vulgar, but now more or less in use in this country among persons in a variety of walks in life.’ ‘Slang consists in part of new words, and in part of words of the legitimate language invested with new meanings.’ ‘Their derivations are often indirect, arising out of fanciful allusions and metaphors, which soon pass out of the public mind, the word remaining, while its origin is forgotten.’ This is a field in which men of every age, religion, country, class, and capacity have exercised their inventiveness, where their caprices have had full swing, and in which the results are numerous. The greater part of those terms in which men speak of intoxication constitute slang, as when we designate those who are drunk as ‘muzzy,’ ‘queer,’ ‘tight,’ ‘elevated,’ ‘heated in imagination,’ or, as ‘not having taken stock of their available condition.’ They are said to be ‘edged,’ ‘fringed,’ ‘over the border,’ ‘over-laden,’ ‘encumbered,’ ‘embarrassed,’ ‘to have all the steam on,’ ‘to have oiled the engine,’ and ‘all the machinery a-going,’ to be ‘off the square,’ and ‘caught in a shower,’ to have ‘lost the ticket,’ and to be ‘off the cue.’ So far has this gone that it has been affirmed that to express the idea of drunkenness, metaphor has been nearly exhausted. There are already more than two hundred slang terms for intoxication. The latest of these occurs in a recent New Orleans paper. A reporter, speaking of the arrest of a woman who was ‘raising a row’ in the streets, says that ‘she was deeply agitated with benzine.’ Another new colloquialism for ‘taking an insidiator’ is said to be due to the Tammany Convention, namely, ‘retiring for consultation.’ Since the volunteer movement commenced, men do not get ‘submerged,’ or ‘engrossed,’ or ‘write on the margin’ so frequently; they ‘file off,’ ‘go to head quarters,’ and ‘forsake the enfilade;’ a drinker soon begins to ‘carry an ensign’ when he has been engaged for a little in ‘shooting right a-head.’ Engineering, from its connection with drainage, has lately got into vogue in some circles, and some of those who are fond of porter fresh from the mug profess themselves pewterers. Plumbers and glass-blowers, doctors and cobblers, councillors and bottleholders, are other words commonly employed in semi-jocular talk for drinkers of different sorts; while ‘to apprehend

Jack'—in allusion to the nursery rhyme—is sometimes used for to take a gill.

The term *cant*, though frequently employed as a synonym for *slang*, has in reality a special signification of its own. In Wedgewood's 'Dictionary of English Etymology,' it is stated that 'cant' is properly the language spoken by thieves and beggars among themselves when they do not wish to be understood by bystanders. It therefore cannot be derived from the sing-song or whining tone in which they demand alms. The real origin is the Gaelic *caint* speech, language applied in the first instance to the special talk of rogues and beggars, and subsequently to the peculiar terms used by any any other profession or community. The Gaelic *can*, means to sing, say, name, call.'

In cant phrase bouse is to drink, *rig* is a 'spree,' and to go *askew* is to get into one's cups ; to throw the gauge is to empty a quart pot ; nase is to be intoxicated ; prygges\* are drunken tinklers or people beastly through liquor. Rum-bouse is wine, and a rum cove is a 'jolly good fellow,' stowlinge-kens are tippling-houses ; and beargered signifies drunk as a lubber.

After we have heard 'some narrow-brained fellow trolling a ballad in the corner of a pot-house,' we are seldom surprised at the coarseness of the language employed in the conversation that ensues. Pot-house talk is usually a very different kind of speech from drawing-room, or even parlour English.

'The Spartans when they strove t' express the loathesomeness  
Of drunkenness to their children brought a slave,  
Some captive Helot, overcharged with wine,  
Reeling in thus:—his eyes shot out with staring;  
A fire in his nose; a burning redness  
Blazing in either cheek; his hair upright;  
His tongue and senses faltering; and his stomach  
Overburdened, ready to discharge her load  
In each man's face he met. This made them see  
And hate that sin of swine and not of men.'

But we are not thus at liberty to bring forward in all its hideousness, the uncleanness, the filthiness and obscenity which the gin-palace roisterer, the beershop haunter, the pot-house frequenter, the tavern parasite, and the hero of the boozing-ken use as speech.

If, however, leaving the prurient, the blasphemous, the profane, and the absolutely blackguardly out of our reckoning,

\* A 'prig' in the nineteenth century is a pickpocket or thief, and in fact, in our higher circles, where they speak slang, not cant, he has grown to be something else, and may be sometimes recognised in a starched neckcloth, with a pretentious, vain, and supercilious bearing, bringing us round nearly to the association of ideas whence the term diverged.

we show that a very large surplusage of language exists which is scarcely admissible into a dictionary, in so far as regards the use that is made of it, we shall be warranted to infer that there is a very considerable amount of human thought given to ideas unsuitable for company-hours and home-speech. The amount of this almost subconscious immorality can scarcely be believed in until we have brought the evidence up to the surface by an examination of some at least of the phraseology of common life. Words are the shadows of ideas, and shadows take their existence from realities, so that if we have words, and many of them too, that are utterly unfit for mention in any literary form, they must show that there is a large amount of extraordinarily loathsome vice in the imaginations of the thoughts of the sinful heart; while if we show that between this horrid sin-suggesting speech and the authorised language of literature there is to be found a large vocabulary of terms which are sin-coloured or vice-glozing, we shall prove that we have much need to consider our words, as well as our ways, and be wise.

'Dictionaries, while they tell us much, yet will not tell us all. How shamefully rich is the language of the vulgar in all lands in words which are not allowed to find place in books, yet which live as a sinful oral tradition on the lips of men, to set forth that which is unholy and impure. And of these words, as no less of those which have to do with the kindred sins of revelling and excess, how many set evil forth with an evident sympathy and approbation, as taking part with the sin against Him who has forbidden it under pain of His extremest displeasure. How much wit, how much talent, yea, how much imagination must have stood in the service of an evil world before it could have had a nomenclature so rich, so varied, and often so heaven-defining as it has.\*'

As the authoress of Adam Bede quaintly observes, 'Our moral sense learns the manners of good society, and smiles when others smile, but when some rough person gives rough names to our actions she is apt to take part against us.' This shows the power of words over us, and it makes it an important question in Social Science how far the present prevalence of 'fast' language and slang and cant suggests or indicates the progress of a moral decline in our home-life and its innocence. 'If,' says Locke, 'we knew the original of all the words we meet with, we should thereby be very much helped to know the ideas they were first applied to and made to stand for.' This would be a clear intellectual gain. But a moral gain is also possible; for if we look on our words as the shadowy reproductions of our thoughts, then from the multiplicity of the words used by us expressive of evil, we may in some measure gauge the wickedness of our hearts; and from the

---

\* Archbishop Trench 'On the Study of Words.'

proneness in us to use euphemistic, round-about, and suggestive instead of forth-right phrases, we may learn the fact of how exceedingly cowardly we are in our sinfulness. ‘Hypocrisy is the homage vice pays to virtue,’ and euphemism is the acknowledgment the soul makes of the need for holiness, because we would not use a cloak for our thoughts if we believed they could stand the light of that true expression which,

‘Like the unchanging sun  
Clears and improves whate’er it shines upon.’

Words, as the signs of thoughts, are not without their lessons. ‘It is,’ for instance, as Archbishop Trench has said, ‘a melancholy thing to observe how much richer is every vocabulary in words that set forth sins, than in those that set forth graces.’ When St. Paul (Gal. v., 19-23) would put these against those, ‘the works of the flesh’ against ‘the fruits of the Spirit,’ those are seventeen, these only nine; and where do we find in Scripture such lists of graces as we do—2 Tim. iii., 2; Rom. i., 29-31, of their opposites? Of this singular, and yet easily accounted-for fact, the following illustrations may be given, as supplying a few curious matters on what may be called the statistics of language. They are chiefly selected from the admirable ‘Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases,’ which Dr. Roget has added to our series of lexicons of synonyms. For positive synonyms of the word *saint*, fourteen terms are given, while its antonym, *sinner*, has a suite of sixty-eight; *temperance* has twenty-seven, and *intemperance* sixty-seven; *chastity* supplies nineteen synonyms, but has as antonyms one hundred and forty-eight words and phrases; *sobriety* has nine paronyms, and stands opposed by ninety-five terms. Of words indicative of *respect* and *approbation*, we have a choice of one hundred and forty-four expressions, but for *contempt* and *disapproval* we can lay hold of three hundred and eighty-eight easily, and yet leave references to a large margin of equally bitter words of taunt and scorn, dislike and reproachfulness. Under the heading *benevolence*, we have an assortment of eighty-eight words and phrases, while under the opposite term *malevolence*, we have ready at hand two hundred and twenty-nine.

Remarkable as these facts are, they are not free from the usual fallacy of statistics. They do, indeed, inform us of the proportions which the terms denoting evil hold with regard to those which refer to well-doing, but they do not, and they can not, supply us with any criterion of the comparative frequency with which the respective sets of terms are employed.

Still, when we reflect that a very large proportion of the language of men is professedly and professionally employed, whether spoken or written, for the betterment of the race, and therefore requires variety and copiousness for literary and artistic grace, and yet that the vocabulary of evil so far exceeds the vocabulary of good, we cannot help fearing that the ratio of frequency of use is even higher than that of researchful interest and inventive ingenuity. What a glimpse into the inner workings of the heart do these facts afford! Do they not show that there is in its ongoings a more frequent need, or at least use, of the language of suffering and of sin, than there is of that of loving-kindness and delight? Language thus bears witness in itself of man's liability to misery, and of the depravity of the human heart whence speech has its issue and spring.

"Another way in which the immorality of words mainly displays itself, one, too, in which they work their greatest mischief, is that of giving honourable names to dishonourable things, making sin plausible, by dressing it out sometimes in the colours of goodness, or, if not so, yet in such as go far to conceal its own native deformity. "The tongue," as St. James has declared, "is a world of iniquity" (iii., 6); or, as some interpreters affirm the words ought rather to be translated, and then they would be still more to our purpose, *the ornament of iniquity*, that which sets it out in fair and attractive colours; and those who understand the original will at once perceive that such a meaning may possibly lie in the words. On the whole, I do not believe that these expositors are right, yet certainly the connection of the Greek word for tongue with our "gloze," "glossy," with the German *gleissen*, to smooth over, or polish, with an obsolete Greek word also, which in like manner signifies "to polish," is not accidental, but real, and may well suggest some searching thoughts as to the use whereunto we turn this "*best*," but as it may also prove "*worst*," member that we have.

"How much wholesomer on all accounts is it, that there should be an ugly word for an ugly thing, one involving moral condemnation and disgust, even at the expense of a little coarseness, rather than one which plays fast and loose with the eternal principles of morality, which shifts the divinely reared landmarks of right and wrong, thus bringing the user under the woe of them "that call evil good and good evil, that put darkness for light and light for darkness, that put sweet for bitter and bitter for sweet" (Isaiah v., 20)—a text on which South has written four of his greatest sermons with reference to this very matter, and bearing the striking title, "On the fatal imposture and force of words." How awful, yea, how fearful, is this force and imposture of theirs, leading men captive at will. There is an atmosphere about them which they are evermore diffusing, an atmosphere of life or death, which we insensibly inhale at each moral breath we draw. "The winds of the soul," as one called them of old, they fill its sails, and are continually urging it upon its course heavenward or to hell. How immense is the difference as to the light in which we learn to regard a sin, according as we have been accustomed to hear it designated by a word which brings out its loathsomeness and deformity; or by one which conceals these\*—which seeks to turn the edge of the divine threatenings against it by a jest †—or worse than all to throw a flimsy veil of sentiment over it. Thus, what a source of mischief in all our country parishes is the one practice of calling a child born out of wedlock a "*love-child*," instead of

\* As in Italy, during the time that poisoning was rife, nobody was said to be poisoned; it was only that the death of some was assisted (*aiutata*). This is the ever-recurring phrase in the historians of the time.

† As, when in France, a subtle poison, by which impatient heirs sought to get rid of those who stood between them and the inheritance which they coveted, was called (*poudre de succession*) heritage powder.

a bastard. It would be very hard to estimate how much it has lowered the tone and standard of morality in them; or for how many young women it may have helped to make the downward way more sloping still. How vigorously ought we to oppose ourselves to all such immoralities of language; which opposition will yet never be easy or pleasant, for many that will endure to commit a sin will resent having that sin called by its right name.

'Coarse as, according to our present usages of language, may be esteemed the word by which our plain-speaking Anglo-Saxon fathers were wont to designate the unhappy women who make a trade of the lusts of men, yet is there a profound moral sense in that word, bringing prominently out as it does the true vileness of their occupation, who for hire are content to profane and lay waste the deepest sanctities of their life. Consider the truth which is witnessed for here as compared with the falsehood of many other titles by which they have been known—names which may themselves be called "whited sepulchres," so fair are they without, yet hiding so much foulness within; as, for instance, that in the French language (*fille de joie*), which ascribes joy to a life which more surely than any other dries up all the sources of joy in the heart, brings anguish, astonishment, blackest melancholy on all who have addicted themselves to it.

'In the same way how much more moral words are the English "sharper" and "blackleg," than the French "*Chevalier d'industrie*;" and, coarse as it is, the same holds good of the English equivalent for the Latin "*conciliatrix*," procress or bawd. In this last word we have a notable example of the putting of bitter for sweet, of the attempt to present a disgraceful occupation in an amiable, almost a sentimental side, rather than in its own true deformity and ugliness.\*

The same evil tendency of euphemism may be noted in the use of other phrases, as, for instance, in the common term for illegitimate offspring as *natural*, a term which impliedly sets nature and legal usage in opposition, and covertly confers the preference on the natural over the legal. Such children are not natural children in the right and proper use of the word. It is not natural for a mother to bring a babe into the world without due care for its welfare and up-bringing; it is not natural for a father to leave an unshared responsibility upon a mother and brand with bastardy the issue of his selfishness. The indulgence of mere carnality without provision of and provision for its consequences is not natural in man, but is inhuman—inhuman in the mother who has sought or given a moment's indulgence to passion at the cost of an uncared-for life for her babe, inhuman in the father who has ungratefully requited the confidence reposed in him, thrown his burden on his helpless partner in guilt, and acted worse than an ostrich to his offspring, showing himself to be a heartless monster, an unnatural parent. Law exists for the common protection of mother, father, child, and society. It is natural that all should concur in conferring all due advantage and security on each, and hence we affirm that a vile sophism underlies the use of *natural* as synonymous with *illegitimate*, as having a baser idea at its root than that of love-child used for bastard. It is a spurious term, chargeable with a flagrant *suggestio falsi*. Similarly the use of 'misfortune' for the result of criminal

---

\* Archbishop Trench 'On the Study of Words,' Lect. II., pp. 45-49.

intercourse, ‘fall’ for sin, ‘unfortunate’ for vicious, ‘paramour’ (one held by love) for kept-miss, ‘*chère amie*’ for strumpet, and many other similar terms, shows how anxious the soul is to glaze over matters of this sort and to hide from itself the hideousness of its criminality by the employment of euphemistic words that suggest but do not express disreputable ideas. There is a force of moral reproof in the terms hussey, drab, trollop, trull, harlot, demirep, mopsy, prostitute, &c., which are not to be found in the milder euphemisms of Lady Anonyma, a city madam, a lady of doubtful ethics, a member of the frail sisterhood, a woman of easy virtue, a person devoted to the public service, a Haymarket friend, *Dame aux Camelias*, woman of pleasure, &c., which are employed to slur the moral and suggest the base.

‘How many words men have dragged downward with themselves, and made partakers more or less of their own fall! Having originally an honourable significance, they have yet, with the deterioration and degeneration of those that used them, deteriorated and degenerated too. What a multitude of words, originally harmless, have assumed a harmful as their secondary meaning; how many worthy have acquired an unworthy. Thus, “knav” meant once no more than lad, “villain” than peasant; a “boor” was only a farmer, a “churl” but a strong fellow. “Time-server” was used two hundred years ago quite as often for one in an honourable as in a dishonourable sense “serving the time.” There was a time when “conceits” had nothing concealed in them; “officious” had reference to offices of kindness, not of busy meddling; “moody” was that which pertained to a man’s mood, without any gloom or sullenness implied. “Demure” (which is *des mœurs*, of good manners) conveyed no hint, as it does now, of an over-doing of the outward demonstration of modesty; in “crafty” and “cunning” there was nothing of crooked wisdom implied, but only knowledge and skill; “craft,” indeed, still retains very often its more honourable use, a man’s “craft” being his skill, and then the trade in which he is well skilled. And think you that Magdalen could have ever given us “maudlin” in its present contemptuous application, if the tears of penitential weeping had been held in due honour in the world?’

Intoxicants have added immensely to our common vocabulary, and have enriched—if we cannot say adorned—our lexicon with many expressive terms. In this case, truly, the *causæ rerum* (causes of things) and the *causæ vocum* (causes of words) are so closely intertwined that but for the existence of the intoxicants the names of their effects would have remained unrequired, and the rich variety of phrases employed in regard to ‘the fatal charms, the many woes of wine,’ would have been unknown in our English tongue—a tongue which so long as the lexicon of intoxication is incorporated with it can scarcely be called ‘the well of English undefiled,’ for it must be confessed by all that places of public traffic in strong drink are not the places to go to, to hear ‘neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient.’

And now we proceed to our illustration of the degradation of words as the evidence of the degradation of the hearts of those who use them. As cast clothes are passed on to

inferiors, as discarded manners descend from the *élite* to the plebeian ranks, and the fashions of the upper ten proceed by degradation through all other classes, so does the language of the witty become the inheritance of the witless, and that which was a euphemism in its earliest utterance becomes the slang of the imitative mob and the cant of a succeeding generation. The elements of the one are continually passing into the grade below, shifting by natural deterioration, and becoming the worse for the wear until, having reached the lowest depths of conversational slang, they find a lower still in the cant of vagabonds and the *argot* of rascals. As an example, we may quote the phrase of ‘the real Simon Pure.’ In 1718, Mrs. Centlivre produced her play, ‘A Bold Stroke for a Wife.’ In this famous comedy, Colonel Feignwell, in order to obtain the hand of Mistress Anne Lovely, adopts the name of a Bristol Quaker, who has been recommended by Aminadab Holdfast to Obadiah Prim as a fitting husband for the lovely young lady. The colonel reaches the scene of action first, and commences operations at once, but is soon commanded by discretion to beat a retreat, as the veritable and authorised suitor is advancing. The colonel concocts a letter, in which the genuine Bristolian is represented to be a disguised housebreaker, who, with the design of robbing Obadiah Prim, and, if need be, of cutting his throat, has resolved on passing himself off as ‘the real Simon Pure.’ The scene in which the *real* and the *counterfeit* Simon Pure confront each other made a deep impression on the public, so that ‘the real Simon Pure’ became the slang phrase of that day for anything genuine and trustworthy. It has now become the cant for undiluted intoxicating drink.

As another instance of the same fact, we may note that Roger North, author of the ‘Examen; or, an Inquiry into the Credit and Veracity of a Pretended Complete History (Kennet’s), 1740,’ tells us that in the *Green Ribbon Club*, London, in the time of Charles II., the Latin phrase, *mobile vulgus*, ‘fickle crowd,’ was facetiously abridged to *mob*. Swift, in his ‘Art of Polite Conversation,’ tells us it had become slang, and it took so amazingly, that Addison thought it would probably become a fixed possession in our language. So it has; but it has also passed into the region of cant, and now two or more ‘patterers,’ or a few thieves who arrange ‘to work a crowd,’ that is, either to impose on it by false news-sheets, &c., or to touch and empty the pockets of the lieges as a joint speculation, are said to engage in a ‘mob.’ A low gambling party, or a set of thimbleriggers, get the same name probably from their mobility of person or of fingers.

A Captain Fudge is said by the elder Disraeli to have been much given to exaggeration and mendacity. His crew taking freedom with English undefiled, instead of using the ordinary word 'lie,' said, 'you fudge it.' Goldsmith, in his 'Vicar of Wakefield,' made the word classical, but it has now become the cant term for the liquor got under false pretences in a shebeen, and, more lately still, for that methylated spirit, or French polish, which some determined drunkards procure under the plea of having a 'finish.' It may not be amiss to give here one or two illustrations of the curiosities of drink-speech, and to cull from the vocabulary of the liquor traffic a few noticeable words:—

Not long ago there died in New York 'a character' known by the *soubriquet* of 'the Whiskey Punch King.' He had been apprenticed to a publican and grocer in Dundee, and on the termination of his engagement he started business, in company with his brother, in the same line of enterprise. Success did not smile upon the efforts of the brother-partners, and about the time when George IV. made his exit to give place to his successor William IV., the two brothers sold off their whole stock and emigrated to New York. This time they determined to confine themselves to the sale of liquors, as more likely to ensure success than such a combination of heterogeneities as groceries implied. They resolved to keep in their store the quality of article which held the best character in their traffic, and to do only a wholesale and family trade. Little reward did their efforts earn, and in an evil moment of despondency the younger brother committed suicide. The elder survivor seemed as dull as if he too were contemplating a similar death, when some condoling friends visited him. He, thankful for their civility, invited them to partake of a 'cheering glass,' and they consented. Well up to the method of making punch of the sort for which Dundee had a notoriety in his youth, he brewed the charmed distillation and gave a pleasing sensation to their appetite. On the morrow they returned craving a repetition of the entrancing brewst, and offered payment, but the host refused to take the money until strongly pressed. After the right of pay had been established, the members of the fraternity paid frequent visits to the punch store and brought others with them. Business so increased with the Whiskey Punch King that he had, before long, six men engaged in dealing out the draught to those who liked potations of that sort. The store in New York where this branch of business began and grew, rapidly increased the wealth of the proprietor, who however could never bring himself to act as mixer for the general public,

though he inaugurated the trade and realised from it a fortune of half a million dollars. His store was called ‘Cobweb Hall,’ and from the peculiar influence produced by the liquor is derived the New York slang for drunk—*cobwebby*. The perhaps unconscious but singularly correct connotation of this drink-word may fairly be enhanced if we remember the origin of the word:—The ‘adder’ creeps beneath the grass, and was also called ‘naedri,’ that is, beneath. In allusion probably to this reptile, poison was called *atter*. The venomous spider was called *attercop*, a name which is still in use in some parts, and from *cop* we have *cobweb*, formerly *copweb*.\* The name gathers interest by recalling the well-known fact regarding strong drink, that ‘at the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder,’ as well as the fate of those who become captivated by it so as to earn the name of drunkard, ‘whose hope shall be cut off, and whose trust shall be a spider’s web.’

‘We have a very common expression to describe a man in a state of ebriety, that “he is as drunk as a beast,” or that “he is beastly drunk.” This is a libel on the brutes, for the vice of ebriety is perfectly human. I think the phrase is peculiar to ourselves, and I imagine I have discovered its origin. When ebriety became first prevalent in our nation, during the reign of Elizabeth, it was a favourite notion among the writers of the time, and on which they have exhausted their fancy, that a man in the different stages of ebriety shewed the most vicious quality of different animals; or that a company of drunkards exhibited a collection of brutes with their different characteristics.

“All drunkards are beasts,” says George Gascoigne, in a curious treatise on them, entitled, “A delicate diet for daintie-mouthde droonkardes, wherein the fowle abuse of common carowing and quaffing with hertie draughtes is honestlie admonished.” By George Gascoigne, Esquier, 1576; and he proceeds in illustrating his proposition; but the satirist Nash has classified eight kinds of “drunkards,” in a fanciful sketch from the hand of a master in humour, one which could only have been composed by a close spectator of their manners and habits.

‘The first is *ape-drunk*, and he leaps and sings, and hollows and danceth for the heavens. The second is *yon-drunk*, and he flings the pots about the house, calls the hostess w—, breaks the glass windows with his dagger, and is apt to quarrel with any man that speaks to him. The third is *swine-drunk*, heavy, lumpish, and sleepy, and crieth for a little more drink, and a few more clothes. The fourth is *sheep-drunk*, wise in his own conceit, when he cannot bring forth a right word. The fifth is *maudlen-drunk*, when a fellow will weep for kindness in the midst of his drink, and kiss you, saying, “By ——! captain, I love thee; go thy way, thou dost not think so often of me as I do of thee: I would I could not love thee so well as I do;” and then he puts his finger in his eye and cries. The sixth is *martin-drunk*, when a man is drunk, and drinks himself sober ere he stir. The seventh is *goat-drunk*, when, in his drunkenness, he hath no mind but on lechery. The eighth is *fox-drunk*, when he is crafty-drunk, as many of the Dutchmen be, which will never bargain but when they are drunk. All these species, and more, I have seen practised in one company at one sitting, when I have been permitted to remain sober amongst them only to note their several humours. These beast drunkards are characterized in a frontispiece to a curious tract on drunkenness, where the men are represented with heads of apes, swine, &c., &c.’†

\* Dr. A. Hoare’s ‘English Roots,’ Lect. I., p. 68.

† Issa: Disraeli’s ‘Curiosities of Literature.’ Drinking Customs in England, p. 287.

'Half-seas over, or nearly drunk,' Disraeli continues, 'is likely to have been a proverbial phrase from the Dutch, applied to that state ofebriety by an idea familiar with those water-rats. Thus, *op-zee*, Dutch, means literally over-sea. Mr. Gifford has recently told us in his "Jonson," that it was a name given to a stupefying beer introduced into England from the Low Countries. Hence, *op-zee*, or over-sea, and *freezeen*, in Germany, signifies to swallow greedily: from this vile alliance they compounded a harsh term, often used in our old plays. Thus, Jonson:—

"I do not like the dulness of your eye,  
It hath a heavy cast, 'tis upsee Dutch." Alchemist, a. 4, s. 2.

And Fletcher has "*upsee-freeze*," which Dr. Nott explains in his edition of Decker's "Gull's Hornbook," as "a tipsy draught, or swallowing liquor till drunk." Mr. Gifford says it was the name of Friesland beer; the meaning, however, was "to drink swinishly like a Dutchman."

Sir Walter Scott, in his 'Peveril of the Peak,' makes Gunlesse speak of 'a Netherland his weasand, which expanded only on these natural and mortal objects of aversion—Dutch cheese, rye bread, pickled herring, onions, and Geneva.' In ordinary slang, too, an entertainment in which the host becomes intoxicated at an earlier time than the guests, is called a 'Dutch feast.'

The mention of Gascoigne's book in the preceding extract reminds us of one of the most curious titles we have seen for quaintness and humour in connection with our subject,—'Drink, and Welcome! or the famous History of the most part of Drinks in use now in the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; with an especial declaration of the potency, virtue, and operation of our English Ale; with a description of all sorts of Waters, from the Ocean Sea to the Tears of a Woman. As also the causes of all sorts of Weather, faire or foul, sleet, raine, haile, frost, snow, fogges, mists, vapours, clouds, storms, windes, thunder, and lightning. Compiled first in the high Dutch tongue by the painful and industrious Huldricke Van Speagle, a grammatical Brewer of Lubbeck, and now most learnedly enlarged, amplified, and translated into English prose and verse by John Taylor. (1637.)' This is John Taylor, 'the King's majesty's water-poet,' who kept a public-house in Phoenix Alley, Longacre. Any book collector of temperance literature might find it useful to be told that in 1698 Ned Ward published a poem, entitled, 'The Sot's Paradise, or the Humours of a Derby Alehouse; with a Satire upon Ale.' Even in the days of Camden, Derby had a reputation for the 'ale brewed in it,' and Smug, in 'The Merry Devil of Edmonton,' says, 'Your ale is as a Philistine fox; Nouns! there's fire i' the tail on't.'

In connection with ale-drinking, the following passage from

Sir Samuel Tuke's 'Adventures of Five Hours' may bear quotation :—

- Silvis.* Tell us what kind of country is this Holland,  
That's so much talked of, and so much fought for.  
*Ernesto.* Why, friend, 'tis a huge ship at anchor  
With a sort of creatures made up of turf  
And butter.  
*Pedro.* Pray, sir, what do they drink in that country ?  
'Tis said there's neither fountains there nor vines.  
*Ernesto.* Friend, they drink there a sort of muddy liquor  
Made of that grain with which you feed your mules.  
*Pedro.* What ! barley ? can that juice quench their thirst ?  
*Ernesto.* You'd scarce believe it could, did you but see  
How oft they drink.  
*Pedro.* But methinks that should make them drunk, camerade !  
*Ernesto.* Indeed, most strangers are of that opinion ;  
But they themselves believe it not, because—  
They are so often.  
*Geraldo.* A nation, sure, of walking tuns ! the world  
Has not the like !  
*Ernesto.* Pardon me, friend ; there is but a great ditch  
Between them and such another nation ;  
If these good fellows would but join and drink  
'That dry, i' faith, they might shake hands. I., ii.

The reference here made to Dutch drinking may remind us that Thomas Nash, town-wit, and himself experimentally acquainted with the qualities of all the drinks of his day, says, in his *Pierce Pennilesse, his Supplication to the Devil*, 1596 :—

'Superfluity in drink is a sin that ever since we have mixed ourselves with the Low Countries is counted honourable; but before we knew their lingering wars was held in that highest degree of hatred that might be. Then, if we had seen a man go wallowing in the streets, or lain sleeping under the board, we should have spit at him, and warned all our friends out of his company.'

He asserts the same Flemish favour for liquor in his 'Sumner's Last Will and Testament,' in these words :—

'Drunkenness of his good behaviour  
Hath testimonial from where he was born :—  
That pleasant work *De Arte Bibendi*  
A drunken Dutchman spewed out a few years since.'

Camden, the historian, affirms that 'the English in their long wars in the Netherlands first learned to drown themselves with immoderate drinking, and by drinking others' healths impair their own. Of all the Northern nations they had been before the most commended for their sobriety ;' but, he adds, 'the vice had so diffused itself over the nation that in our days it was first restrained by severe laws ;' and it is a fact that many statutes against drunkenness were passed in the reign of James I. Referring to this topic, the elder Disraeli remarks :—

'Of this folly of ours, which was, however, a borrowed one, and which lasted for two centuries, the history is curious: the variety of its modes and customs; its freaks and extravagances; the technical language introduced to raise it into an art; and the inventions contrived to animate the progress of the thirsty souls of its votaries.'

Of these curiosities in literature about drunkenness he instances Nash's enumeration, 'Now he is nobody that cannot drink *supernaculum*; *carouse* the hunter's *hoope*, quaff *upzee frieze crosse*; with healths, gloves, mumps, frolickes, and a thousand other domineering inventions.' The term *skinker* meaning, he says, a filler of wine, butler, or cupbearer; and in taverns a *drawer*, as appears in our dramatic poets, is Dutch, or, according to Dr. Notts, purely Danish, from *skenker*.

'The Saxons, like most of the northern natives, were hard drinkers, and it is a subject of regret that their descendants, at the present day, have not altogether lost this not very creditable character. They were not less remarkable for their hospitality than for their love of strong drink, and did not like to see their guests, any more than themselves, leave a drop in the bottom of their capacious tankards. Hence they called it a "*carouse*" when they drank *all out*, the word *gar* signifying "all," and *ous* meaning "out;" hence the *g* being changed to *c*, to "*carouse*" (anciently *garouse*), was to drink *all out*.\*'

The word "wassail," defined by Dr. Johnson as a drunken bout, comes from the old Saxon words *was* and *heal*, that is "be of good health;" *was* being the imperative of the Saxon verb signifying to be, of which we still have the imperfect tense, and *heal* signifying health. The custom of pledging healths arose, it is probable, out of the savage habits of the times, when every man dreaded treachery and murder, but when at the same time the most violent among them respected a pledge and strictly kept their word. When a man took up the large tankard to drink he pledged his word to his neighbour that he would protect him, while drinking, from violence, if the other would pledge his *troth*, that is, his "truth," in like manner, for his safety, while he was in the act of drinking, and thereby obstructing his view, and exposing his throat to an enemy.† "Wassail" is also sometimes used to signify what in the Midland Counties is called *lamb's wool*, i.e., roasted apples in strong beer, with sugar and spices, and thence from its results festivity, intemperance, and riot.

'The Queen carouses to thy fortune, Hamlet.'—*Shakespeare*.

In explanation of this word, Mr. Gifford remarks:—"This word has never been properly explained. It occurs in *Hamlet*, where it is said by Steevens, as well as Johnson, to mean a quantity of liquor rather too large; the latter derives it from *ruse*, half-drunk, Germ., while he brings *carouse* from *gar ause*, all out! *Rouse* and *carouse*, however, like *veye* and *revye*, are but the reciprocation of the same action, and must, therefore, be derived from the same source. A *rouse* was a large glass ('not past a pint,' as Iago says), in which a health was given, the drinking of which by the rest of the company formed a *carouse*. Barnaby Rich is exceedingly angry with the inventor of this custom, which, however, with a laudable zeal for the honour of his country, he attributes to an Englishman, who, it seems, 'had his brains beat out with a pottlepot' for his ingenuity." "In former ages," says he, "they had no conceit whereby to draw on drunkennesse"—(Barnaby was no great historian)—"their best was, I drink to you, and I pledge you, till at length some shallow-witted drunkard found out the *carouse*, an invention of that worth

\* This 'carousing' tending to frequent quarrels, and many other evils, the Saxon King Edgar enacted a law, which he strictly enforced, ordering that certain marks should be made in their drinking cups, at a particular height, above which they were forbidden to fill them under a heavy penalty. This law, however, as Rapin relates, was but a short time in continuance, being too much opposed to the national character to be long maintained.

† Dean Hoare's 'English Roots,' Lect. II., p. 76-8.

and worthinesse as it is pitie the first founder was not hanged, that we might have found out his name in the antient record of the hangman's register."—*English Hu and Cry*, 1617, p. 24. It is necessary to add, that there could be no *rouse* or *carouse* unless the glasses were emptied. "The leader," continues honest Barnaby, "soupes up his brosth, turnes the bottom of the cuppe upward, and in ostentation of his dexteritie, gives it a phylip, to make it cry *tynge!*" *id.* "In process of time, both these words were used in a laxer sense."—*Philip Massinger's Works*, edited by William Gifford, p. 61.

\* Rustic meetings of festivity, at particular seasons, were formerly called *ales*, as Church-ale, Whitsun-ale, Bride-ale, Midsummer-ale, &c. Carew, in his *Survey of Cornwall*, edition 1769, p. 68, gives the following account of the Church-ale, with which it is most likely the others agreed:—"For the Church-ale, two young men of the parish are yearly chosen by their last foregoers, to be wardens, who, dividing the task, make collection among the parishioners, of whatever provision it pleaseth them voluntarily to bestow. This they employ in brewing, baking, and other acates, against Whitsontide, upon which holydays the neighbours meet at the church-house, and there merily feede on their owne victuals, contributing by some petty portion to the stock, which by many smalls growtheth to a meetly greatness; for therer is entartayned a kinde of emulation betweene these wardens, who, by his graciefulness in gathering, and good husbandry in expending, can best advance the church's profit. Besides, the neighbour parishes at those times lovingly visit one another, and this way frankly spend their money together. The afternoons are consumed in such exercises as olde and yong folke (having leasure) doe accustomably ware out the time withall. In the subsequent pages, Carew enters into a defence of those meetings, which, in his time, had become productive of riot and disorder, and were among the subjects of complaint by the more rigid Puritans."

From Hippocrates, the most celebrated physician of antiquity, born in Cos about B.C. 460, we get the name of an aromatic medicated wine, which was formerly much used in this country at all great entertainments, and much spoken of by the poets and dramatists, *Hippocras*. It was a compound of equal parts of Lisbon and Canary, and was prepared, according to an old *recipe*, thus: 'for lords, with gynger, synamon, and graynes, sugour, and turesoll; and for comyn pepull, gynger, canell, long pepper, and clarifyed honey' formed the spices used. This wine was strained, and, as the woollen bag used by apothecaries to strain syrups and decoctions requiring clarification was called *Hippocrates' Sleeve*, this accident may have connected the ancient physician's name with this modern strong drink. The poets are known frequently to have mistaken this *hippocras* for *Hippocrene*, the fountain of the horse Pegasus.

*Bastard* seems to have been a mixed Spanish wine. Henderson, in his 'History of Wines,' is puzzled to tell what it was. Shakespeare speaks, in 'Measure for Measure,' of 'white and brown *bastard*', and makes Jack Falstaff say 'your brown *bastard* is your only drink.' In Beaumont and Fletcher's 'The Woman's Prize, or the Tamer Tamed,' we get this hint of its quality:—

‘I was drunk with *bastard*,  
Whose nature ‘tis to form things like itself—  
Heady and monstrous.’ II., i.

A liquor composed of honey and ale was, in Shakespeare's time, from the high tone it gave to the talk of its consumers, called *Braggart*; and for the same reason, namely, that it inspirited those who drunk it to set their *caps* in a *huffy* manner, it was called huff-cap.

'Colonel Negus (Archbishop Trench says), in Queen Anne's time, first mixed the beverage which goes by his name.' The quaint name of *grog* is said to be derived from a nickname of Admiral Vernon, who introduced it into the service. In bad weather he was in the habit of walking the deck in a rough grogram cloak; the sailors thence called him Old Grog, and then transferred the name to the drink, which, as it consisted of spirits diluted with water, the hero of Portobello had contrived as a means of diminishing intoxication among his old salts.

*Gin* does not, despite the similarity of its form, derive its name from its being a snare, a trap, an ingenious contrivance for bringing to evil. It is an abbreviation of Geneva, which is a corruption of *genievre*, a juniper berry, because, when genuine, gin is flavoured in distillation by the addition of juniper berries, which are so called because the plant on which they grow produces younger berries while the elder ones are ripening. So that *gin* is ultimately derived, through the French, from the Latin words *juniōr* and *pario*. This derivation gives the key to the double entendre contained in the slang of Shakespeare's time, when Geneva drink and Geneva doctrines were alike new and uppermost in the thoughts of many (different) minds; e.g., Graccho, a scoundrel character in Massinger's 'Duke of Milan,' is made to say:—

<i>Julio</i> (a courtier). <i>Graccho.</i>	'If you meet An officer preaching of sobriety Unless he read it in Geneva print Lay him by the heels.  But think you 'tis a fault To be found sober? 'Tis a capital treason.'      I. i.
---	---

The same jest occurs in the 'Merry Devil of Edmonton,' where Blague, the host of 'The George,' at Waltham, says to Smug, the smith:—'Smith ! I see by thy eyes thou hast been reading a little Geneva print : *i.e.*, been drinking gin till blear-eyed. This host is a great translator of *Cooper's Dictionary*, a joke about the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, by Thomas Cooper, 1584, and *Cooper's* casks; as when he says, 'Come, follow me ! I have Charles's Wain (*i.e.*, the seven stars in the constellation of Ursa Minor) below in a butt of sack. It will glisten you like a crab fish.' We ought not, in connection

with the word gin, to forget that when the Permissive Bill Movement succeeds the lines in Pope's *Dunciad* will become a prophecy of the lamentation of the publicans :—

‘Thee shall each alehouse, thee each gillhouse mourn  
And answering gin-shops sourer sighs return.’

It is not a little remarkable in some of the writers of the middle ages to read high praises of *vinum theologicum*, a general term for those choice wines which were the products of the lands of the church, which in those days were not only the best cultivated, but the most secure from devastation during feudal broils or war. But the names of some of the medicated liquors of that time are suggestive of the *vinum theologicum* in a more express sense—for example, an infusion of toasted Seville oranges and sugar in light (Burgundy) wine is known by the name of *Bishop*. As Dean Swift says :—

‘Come buy my fine oranges! . . . .  
Well roasted with sugar and wine in a cup,  
They'll make a sweet *Bishop* when gentlefolks sup.’

When old Rhine wine is used in the mixture, it receives the name of *Cardinal*, but when Tokay is the liquor, it becomes so superlative as to be worthy to bear the tip top title of the *Pope*. It may be remarked that such spiced wine constituted so voluptuous a beverage, and ‘was deemed so unsuitable to the members of a profession which had foresworn all the pleasures of life, that the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (817 A.D.) forbade the use of it to the regular clergy, except on days of solemn festivals.’ We do not know that the clergy were permitted to drink Canary ; perhaps it was a wine of a too frolicsome nature for priests, from its tendency to

‘Make you dance canary  
With sprightly fire and motion.’

But if we could believe in the *Epistolae Ho-Elianæ*, or Familiar Letters of James Howell, Historiographer-Royal of Charles II., the priesthood ought not only to have drunk copiously of Canary themselves, but to have strongly commended it to their hearers as a good substitute for their teaching, unless (as we fear must be thought to be the case), James Howell was in a satirical humour when he wrote, for he says :—‘Of this wine, if of any other, may be verified the merry induction, that good wine maketh good blood, good blood causeth good humours, good humours cause good thoughts, good thoughts bring forth good works, good works carry a man to heaven ; ergo, good wine carrieth a man to

heaven. If this be true, surely more English go to heaven this way than any other; for I think there is more Canary brought to England than to all the world besides.' Despite the episcopal patronage of wine indicated in the phrases and terms above quoted, and the implied favour for it among the clergy, there can be no doubt that Chaucer had a better idea of the antipathy between wine and good works than to regard it as *vinum theologicum*. This we may learn from *The Pardoner's Tale*, in these terms:—

'A lecherous thing is wine, and dronenesse  
Is ful of striving and of wretchednesse.  
O drunken man, disfigured is thy face,  
Sour is thy breth, foul art thou to embrace:  
And thurgh thy dronken nose semeth the soun,  
As though thou saidst ay, Sampson, Sampson:  
And yet, God wot, Sampson dronk never no wine.  
Thou fallest, as it were a stiked swine:  
Thy tongue is lost, and all thin honest cure,  
For dronenesse is veray sepulture  
Of mannes wit, and his discretion.  
In whom that drinke hath denomination,  
He can no counsel kepe, it is no drede.  
Now kepe ye fro the white and fro the rede,  
And namely fro the white wine of Lepe,  
That is to sell in Fish-strete and in Chepe.  
This wine of Spaigne crepeth subtilly  
In other wines growing faste by,  
Of which ther riseth swiche fumositee,  
That when a man hath drunken draughtes three,  
And weneth that he be at home in Chepe,  
He is in Spaigne, right at the toun of Lepe.'

It is curious to remark how large a portion of the English lexicon is taken up with those words which refer directly to the abuse of alcoholic liquors. We have among the names applied to those persons who partake of—should we say *indulge in*?—these fluid deceivers such terms as these:—tippler, drunkard, toper, sot, soaker, toss-pot, reveller, carouser, bacchanal; for the condition of being affected by intoxicants:—ebriety, inebriety, inebriation, insobriety, ebriosity, bibbacy, bibulency, drinking, drunkenness, drunkenship, tippling, toping, temulency, compotation, sottishness, revelling, carousing, intoxication; for indicating the state of a person who has been using drink:—tasting, fresh, flush, flustered, disguised, overcome, overtaken, mellow, groggy, topheavy, lightheaded, elevated, screwed, muggy, muzzy, muddled, fuddled, nappy, tipsy, turned, touched, inebriated, temulent, potulent, boozy, heady, hipped, stretched, strung, sprung, strained, cut-up, cat-eyed, drunk, drunken, intoxicated, lousy, maudlin, dead-drunk, bung-up, reeling, &c., to which we may add the phrases,—in one's cups, the worse for liquor,

half seas over, drunk as a piper, a fiddler, an owl, or a lord, under the table, rather limp, somewhat overhauled, grog-witted; while we speak of habitual drinkers as cuppish, sottish, bibacious, liquorish, devoted to Bacchus, &c. The use of strong drink gives to our English tongue the following verbs:—tipple, tope, booze, swill, Guzzle, carouse, liquor, fuddle, drink, soak, sot, swig, inebriate, intoxicate, puzzle, temulate, and to be intemperate, anti-teetotal, compotative, &c. Compare this plentifulness of vocabularian distinctions, reaching from the first tremulous overpush of the balance of the faculties in *fresh* to their complete obliteration in dead-drunk, with the scanty replenishment of phrases supplied for use on the opposite side of temperance. We have, it is true, moderate as a sort of see-saw go-between, temperate, somewhat in advance of that, and sober, abstinent, teetotal, very proper terms indeed; from these we get moderation, temperance, sobriety, abstinence, teetotalism, &c., words which bring no connotation of debauch, orgies, revels, and instead of leading the mind to think of the circean cup—

‘Whose pleasing poison  
The visage quite transforms of him that drinks,  
And the inglorious likeness of a beast  
Fixes instead, unmoulding reason’s mintage  
Charactered in the face,’

leads us rather to take for beverage ‘Adam’s wine,’ whereof tasting we are inclined to exclaim with the same poet—

‘Oh madness to think use of strongest wines  
And strongest drinks our chief supports of health  
When God, with these forbidden, made choice to rear  
His mighty champion, strong above compare,  
Whose drink was only from the liquid brook.’

When the taste for drink becomes intensified by habit, and poverty affords no means of purchasing the usual dram of ‘sky-blue,’ as gin used to be called, though it now bears the more appropriate name of ‘blue ruin,’ from its extraordinary capacity for inducing that state of despondency suggestive of ruin of health, ‘the blues,’ as it is called in its earlier stages, while in the later ones it reaches the dignity of being denominated ‘the blue devils,’ the solicitous but unstickling appetite of the drink-captive will drive him to buy a ha’porth of ‘alls’—the tap-droppings and refuse of the liquors dispensed in gin-palaces gathered up into vessels. These preserved ‘drops’ of brandy, gin, rum, spirits, &c., are mixed and sweetened especially for drink-fond females whose funds have run low, and are dispensed under the euphemistic name of ‘loveage,’ which we presume is a cunning transmutation

for *leavings*, or *beggar's-dregs*. Is there not a great mass of experience, wit, and truth wrapped up in that other cant term for gin, ‘diddle?’ ‘Cat’s water’ is another and a stranger as well as stronger term for it when full proof, but it is contemptuously styled ‘cat lap’ when not the real stingo, and when it is, an enthusiastically poetical feeling comes over the little remnant of soul left in the dissipated consumer of the ‘breaky-leg’ potion, which he designates ‘cream of the valley.’ When gin is of this sort it is styled the ‘duke,’ in recognition of its high character and power of making its partaker as ‘drunk as a lord’ or (jolly companions!) as ‘drunk as David’s sow.’ This ‘eye-water’ is sometimes not quite good enough for your ‘fast young swells.’ They indulge in ‘flesh and blood,’ as they call brandy and port mixed in half and half quantities, or if they are university trained, with a dim notion of the ancient physician Hippocrates, they may prefer ‘copus,’ a diminutive parody of this liquid preparation, and bemuse themselves with ale spiced and flavoured, probably somewhat highly, with wines, spirits, &c., with as much gusto as their common-place neighbours take ‘cooper,’ i.e., half stout and half porter, as their ‘common sewer’ or ‘drain’ when ‘doing a wet’ and engaged in ‘going it’ on the ‘spree’—from the French *esprit*, sprightliness—or as university chums phrase it, ‘visiting Berlin,’ a capital city always on the Spree.

Slang supplies us with quite a profusion of epithets for that waste of life which drink induces in all its shades, degrees, relations, and implications. We begin by being ‘balmy,’ become thereafter a little ‘hazy,’ then get ‘spiffed,’ and afterwards ‘foggy.’ We cannot be long ‘on the batter,’ or ‘on the go,’ till, having got ‘queer in the attic,’ we feel ‘rather of the ratherest,’ and getting ‘off our nut,’ feel ‘the sun in our eyes’ for awhile, and perceive that ‘there’s something rotten in the state of Denmark;’ whereon we become ‘mooney,’ find our intellects ‘jacoberd,’ and our whole being ‘up the ladder,’ which is the slang synonym for the euphemism of polite society, ‘elevated.’ When one has ‘got on his beaver,’ or is ‘slated’ and ‘tipt,’ he is apt to become ‘obfuscated,’ or ‘fishy;’ perhaps ‘lumpy,’ or ‘podgy’—for it is one of the many strange effects of being ‘primed,’ that we cannot continue ‘doing it brown’ and ‘chalking it up,’ without ‘bemusing’ ourselves and feeling ‘buffy,’ or ‘bosky,’ although we assert that we are ‘all-there-ish,’ despite the ‘gummyness’ of our state, or our ‘muggy’ and ‘muzzy’ appearance. If we set out to ‘Corinthianise,’ and ‘go in for a buster,’ we can scarcely avoid getting ‘groggy,’ or ‘lushy,’ perhaps ‘scammered,’ and ‘slewed,’ in this state we may ‘flare up’ and

turn ‘kisky’ or ‘frisky,’ and show that we are ‘on the freshet’ or getting ‘kiddyish,’ by having ‘opened the sluices,’ because there was ‘a screw loose.’ If after partaking of ‘summat short’ we feel ‘wobbleshoppie’ or ‘winey,’ and somewhat touched with the ‘wiffle-waffles’ from ‘wetting our whistle,’ begin to ‘wabble,’ as if we were ‘twisted,’ ‘touched,’ ‘top-heavy,’ and ‘tol-lollish,’ or ‘tight,’ the consciousness of being ‘titley’ and ‘three sheets in the wind’ may bring us to the ‘blues,’ or, having rendered us ‘bluey,’ and given us the feeling of being ‘ploughed,’ ‘plucked,’ ‘corned,’ and ‘sewed up,’ may make us ‘snuffy’ and anxious for a ‘stretcher.’ But if we get fully ‘on the rantan,’ or the ‘re-raw,’ ‘we won’t go home till morning-ish,’ and ‘coxy-loxy,’ it is probable we may engage in ‘getting up a barney,’ or be found ‘sky wan-nocking’ under an attack of the ‘gravel-rash,’ or ‘sky-kick-ing,’ all ‘mops and brooms,’ in a ‘lap in the gutter’ state, asserting our right to be called ‘Lushington,’ and showing ourselves ‘Bobby-peelerish,’ in which case we may prove the necessity of ‘putting in the pin,’ ‘teetotally,’ in ‘quod,’ eschewing henceforward the ‘hap’orth of liveliness’ to be gotten from ‘neck-oil’ in any ‘shivery’ where ‘sensations’ of ‘knock-down,’ hot tiger,’ and ‘lightning’ are dispensed in any ‘boozing-ken’ or drinkery in which men are tempted ‘to go to pot.’ Thus slang takes us from the small-beer of intoxication to the highest degree of fuddlement, and shows us how the process goes on from ‘swipey’ up to ‘sky-kicking,’ and then down to gutterdom, and being ‘held in possession,’ in one or two of its significations, by the ‘Blues.’ May men not truly learn from this that if they desire to have ‘the main brace spliced,’ it is not to be done by getting it made ‘knotty’ and ‘tight’ with ‘white tape,’ as liquor is sometimes called, but by taking for that purpose Robert Burns’s ‘stern resolve, that earle-stalk of hemp in man,’ and henceforward avoiding the navigation of the ‘Spree?’ The logical ultimation of the vice of drunkenness is clearly demonstrated in the expressive, progressive, and degressive vocabulary appropriated to it in common speech—a vocabulary alternating from ether to smile, showing how, under the influence of drink, man’s moral nature deliquesces, and the ‘pot-valiancy’ it induces results in terrific and loathsome defeat, only utterable by the gan-grenous rhetoric of the slums, the beershop, the ginnery, the shandy-gaff, and the slushing-ken.

‘Evil,’ says the glorious Jean Paul Richter, ‘is like the nightmare, the moment you bestir yourself it has ended.’ Let the downward-going drinker determine on an upward course of temperance, and say, ‘I will rise like a living man by

swimming, not like a drowned man by corruption ; and then, under the purifying and consolidating power of exalted feelings and new habits, the texture of his character will grow fairer and firmer, conscience will exert its monarchic sway, and all that is slangy shall fall off from his moral being and his temporal well-being.

It is not without a thorough knowledge of the destructive and pernicious effects of intoxicating drinks that they are partaken of by those whose appetites are debased and depraved by their use. No phrases, in fact, could be more condemnatory than those employed by the frequenters of the beershop and the gin palace, in speaking of these so-called beverages. Gin, though sometimes spoken of in such flattering terms as ‘water of life,’ and ‘cream of the valley,’ is not unfrequently denoted by the less commendatory designations of ‘flash of lightning,’ ‘stingo,’ and ‘blue ruin.’ Women sometimes take it in the form of ‘tape,’ ‘white satin,’ and ‘white wine ;’ but when they get ‘cut’—which is an expressive word for ‘tipsy’—they sometimes venture on ‘flip,’ or ‘hot flannel,’ which is a mixture of gin and beer taken hot. When men go into a ‘sluicery’ for a ‘sensation,’ a ‘drain,’ or a ‘common sewer,’ they call the glass of gin they seek, in allusion to the juniper, a ‘nipper,’ or, more briefly, a ‘nip,’ occasionally a ‘bite,’ and not unfrequently it turns out a ‘flogger.’ University men make pets of ‘hot tigers,’ as they call ale and sherry spiced and warm; in Cambridge, we believe, it gets the name of ‘copus,’ and the peculiar sensation experienced after a night’s befuddlement is called by the commonalty ‘hot coppers’ in its early stages, though it gradually intensifies into the ‘blues,’ the ‘horrors,’ and the ‘blue devils,’—known learnedly as *delirium tremens*. Brandy is sometimes called ‘French cream,’ but is not uncommonly spoken of familiarly as ‘Oh Davy’ (O D V, for Eau de vie). When mixed with port, it is known as ‘flesh and blood,’ and when gin is taken with it, by naming the cause from the effect, it gets the name of ‘twist.’ When it has produced the due sensation of one’s being ‘ploughed,’ the next step is to go in for a ‘peg,’ that is, a draught of brandy and soda-water. Gin is ingeniously baptised ‘diddle,’ and when it is diluted in beer it is denominated ‘dog’s-nose,’ a sufficient quantity of which is known as a ‘dodger,’ and the effect produced by its consumption is called ‘Dutch courage.’ Porter is ‘heavy wet,’ and makes men ‘top-heavy’ and ‘jiggered.’ Ale is ‘knock-down,’ and makes the consumer ‘swankey,’ and, though ‘screwed,’ indicates ‘a screw loose.’ ‘Bunker,’ ‘rot-gut,’ and ‘belly-vengeance’ are other terms for beer; and when these have

shewn themselves as ‘breaky leg’ over night, it is orthodox to have

‘Twopenn’orth o’ *purl*  
Good “early purl”  
‘Gin all the world  
To put your hair right in curl  
When you “feel yourself queer” in the morning.’

This endeavour to get up a system by stimulation has given rise in America to the manufacture of ‘cocktail’ (a compound of whisky, brandy, or champagne, bitters, and ice), dexterously mixed in tall silver mugs made for the purpose, called ‘cocktail-shakers.’ Having partaken of this ‘strong circean liquor,’

They swim in mirth and fancy that they feel  
Divinity within them breeding wings  
Wherewith to scorn the earth.’

But it is not long before the tap-root must be touched again to supply a ‘refresher,’ in the shape of ‘a hair of the dog that bit’ the drinker, as a new dose of the intoxicant is called. And may we not cite that very word *intoxication* as another proof that the evil results of such ‘refreshments’ are fully known, for is not its root *toxicum* a poison, and has not an invitation to drink been translated by the fast men of our day, in allusion to this very fact, into the phrase ‘nominate your poison?’ That is the modern mode of trying to ‘warm the cockles of the heart,’ and ‘comfort the inner man,’ to ‘doctor’ one’s self, and bring one’s self ‘up to the mark!’ Fielding, the novelist, speaks of the permission to open a shop for the sale of distilled spirituous liquors as ‘a license to poison,’ and calls it a traffic ‘which, if not put a stop to, will infallibly destroy a great part of the inferior people.’ In the same tract, he calls attention to a work issued in 1736, entitled ‘Distilled Spirituous Liquors, the Bane of the Nation.’

Slang recognises in the terms ‘on the shine,’ ‘mooney,’ and ‘luney,’ the close connection between drunkenness and lunacy; and we know that it is a very direct effect of drink to produce

‘Demoniac phrensy, moping melancholy,  
And moon-struck madness.’

Dr. Johnson says maudlin is derived from the corrupt appellation of Magdalen, who is drawn by painters with swollen eyes and disordered look; a drunken countenance seems to have been so named from a ludicrous resemblance to the picture of ‘Magdalen,’ and he adds that the word means drunk, fuddled, approaching to ebriety. Another

lexicographer with quiet satire remarks, ‘Magdalen’ College, at Oxford, is usually pronounced ‘maudlin,’ which makes this etymology the more probable.

‘Is there a parson much bemused in beer,  
A maudlin poetess, a rhyming peer,  
A clerk foredoomed his father’s soul to cross?’—

Who does not see in this etymology an acknowledgment of the connection between drink and stupidity? Even the voice of the tombstone, when candid, tells the same story of the enmity of drink in the end, as in the lines on a licensed victualler in the church of Darenth, near Dartford, in Kent:—

‘Oh the liquor he did love, but never will no moe  
For what he loved did turn his foe  
For on the 28th of January 1741 that fatal day  
The debt he owed he then did pay.’

Whatever we may think of this as verse, it gives assurance of the fact that there is woe in strong drink—a fact vouched for, too, in our proverbial literature:—

“More perish by intemperance than are drowned in the sea.” Is this anything better than a painful, yet at the same time a flat truism? But let it be put in this shape: More are drowned in the wine-cup than in the ocean; or, again, in this: More are drowned in beer and in wine than in water (and these both are German proverbs), and the assertion assumes quite a different character. There is something that lays hold on us now. We are struck with the smallness of the cup as set against the vastness of the ocean, while yet so many more deaths are ascribed to that than to this; and, further, with the fact that literally none are, and none could be, drowned in the former, while multitudes perish in the latter.\*

Thus, we see that common experience as expressed in proverbs and popular knowledge, registered in words, prove conclusively that the danger and the disgrace of liquoring habits is perfectly admitted as a fact, of which the intellect has not fair ground for doubting; and yet we know that the moral of this knowledge has not sunk sufficiently into the hearts of men to persuade and convince them of the perniciousness of the habits of society which are concerned with the drink-traffic, and the indulgence in which it finds patronage.

On a thoughtful consideration of the several matters in connection with what may be called English byway words, we think the following remarks may be justified. That the right use of right words is as important for the culture and purity of the conscience, as for the preservation of a good style, and the promotion of perspicuity. That words are true witnesses regarding the ideas which commonly hold a place in men’s minds. That the prevalence of wicked words—literary and vernacular—proves that ‘the imaginations of the thoughts’ of

\*Archbishop Trench ‘On the Lessons in Proverbs.’ Lect. I., p. 17.  
Vol. 12.—No. 45. D

the human heart are very evil; and that the ready and popular use of words wearing an innocent look, yet concealing an inner allusion to depraved habits or sinful customs, shows that the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. But more particularly, and coming more closely to our present point, we believe we may safely affirm, that the extraordinarily copious special lexicon of the drink-traffic and the habits connected with it, or the results flowing from it, demonstrates its prevalence, power, and activity, its widespread influence, its popularity and pervasion of all ranks, classes, and professions. But more even than this, the largeness of the number of the euphemisms which have been gathered round it, proves that drunkenness is a cunning, hypocritical, soul-condemned practice, afraid of detection, sneaking and ashamed, soul-deceiving too, for it invents plausible phrases that it may feign to use as the words of truth and soberness. What a miserable picture does language show us of the workings of the hearts of those who wish to keep drinking respectable; what a shrinking horror of the rude, rough, honest, outspoken, expressive language of the times, when men seemed what they were, and what a kindly welcoming of the great insidious vice into the bosom ! If of the social drinking customs of our age it is a shame even to speak, how much more shameful ought it be to practise and encourage them ? The very language which we use regarding drink proves that in our use of it we stand self-condemned within our own souls, and, in the inner sanctuary of our own consciences, seek to palter with the truth, by employing language in a double or a doubtful sense. Let the whole cobwebbery of sophistic euphemism and cant which the drink-traffic has woven round itself be swept away, let drink and its sale be spoken of in plain, intelligible, round, unvarnished terms, and how long would the demon of iniquity hold his place of triumph and malign influence ? Scared by the blunt honesty of words so used as to express truth above all things, the soul would stand aghast at its depravity, conscience would awaken from its infernal spell-bound trance, repentance would seize on the spirit, and reform—God-blessed personal reform—would scatter at once to the winds the power of the treacherous enemy, and sober earnestness would supplant routine and fashion, and the passive following of the common practices of our generation in regard to the drink customs of society. Then, indeed, might we hope for the triumph of ‘*Meliora*’—better things.

---

## THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

THE common law of this country recognises in the married woman only a sort of appendage to her husband. In the contemplation of the law, as it is coolly stated, ‘The husband and wife are one person, and the husband is that person.’ If we were to say that England and Scotland are one island, and England is that island, our Scottish friends would lift the sounding shell of protest at once; but Scotland and England, although they are united, have not been married, and Scotia manages to hold her own. The principality, on the other hand, would seem to have entered into full enjoyment of the matrimonial blessings. Wales, like a savage bride, was first well beaten and then annexed; and so it happens that England and Wales are at this day one kingdom, and that England is that kingdom.

In our Common Law Courts, the married woman, as far as concerns her possession of property, is not held to have any legal existence independently of her husband. In a sense which has no reference to her bulk, she is pronounced ‘incapable of contracting’; and although her tongue and ears are not actually taken from her, yet it is declared that she can neither sue nor be sued. Her property at marriage ceases to be her’s, and vests in her husband, or passes under his management and control during their joint lives. If it is ‘real estate,’ the husband, it is true, must go through the formality of getting her consent, by some process or other, ere he can sell it; but as long as he and she both live, the whole income from it is the husband’s, to have and to hold, to spend or to give, to waste or to throw away; and he is not bound in law to make any special provision for her out of it. As for her personal property, it is his absolutely; and her leasehold property likewise is his, except that if he happens not to sell it, and she survives him, she can reclaim it. Neither for her nor her children is he bound to make any provision for the future out of the property she brings. And all that she earns during marriage is his. In short, the case between the pair is just as described in the old tale:—‘What’s yours is mine, and what’s mine’s my own;’ thus John exults, and Joan has no remedy.

Woman had never gone in this way to the wall in past dark ages whilst common law was being slowly brewed and distilled, had not her sex been found to be the weakest;—weakest physically, which is the most decisive point of weakness in all but very highly civilised states; weakest intellectually, which again

is fatal to any claim in days when muscle and intellect are the two sole lords of life ; only strongest morally and religiously, which sort of strength is accounted as another and worse sort of weakness by all except God and the children of light. And so being weakest, woman went to the wall, and got sadly bruised against it. And if the men who made the law had not had daughters as well as wives, the system would not have received the slightest mitigation. But it happened that the equity of the case was apt to assume contrary aspects when viewed from different points. To take a woman to wife and to sweep all her property into one's chest by the same process was, of course, unobjectionable and equitable, so long as she was another man's daughter. But that another man should do this with one's own daughter was not exactly the same sort of thing. One's own daughter certainly might require protection for her property ; it could not be just that she should be deprived of all at the mere pleasure of her husband. And so the men who made the law were driven to devise an elaborate system under which, by ante-nuptial arrangement, the unjust common law might be defeated. The common law was good enough as between themselves and their wives, but it was not quite the sort of thing for the equitable interests of their daughters. Therefore, said they, let it be over-ridden for the benefit of these daughters. And as these daughters happened all to be rich men's daughters, the over-riding was made possible for the wealthy alone. For although the poor daughter's one ewe lamb is really of more concern to her than the rich daughter's flock is to the rich daughter, yet who cared in those days for the feelings or welfare of the poor ? Such, accordingly, is the law of property for married women as it stood of yore in England, and as it continues to this day.

Contrivances for protecting the daughters of the rich were very cautiously introduced. First, the wife's separate existence was recognised just far enough to enable trustees to hold property for her outside the control of her husband. Afterwards, it was arranged that the wife should in respect of this separate property 'enjoy,' as the lawyers say, 'all the incidents of property ;'—contract and be made liable on her contracts, and indirectly sue and be sued in equity. Next, it was agreed that a husband might be a trustee for his wife, and be called to account on her behalf. Later on, in order to preserve rich men's daughters from suffering from their own imprudence or from the undue influence of the husband, a process was invented whereby the wife could be restrained from anticipating the income of her separate property ; so that no act of her own should deprive her of the right of receiving her dividends

as they became due. Means also were devised by which, after marriage, a wife becoming entitled to property as next of kin, or by will, might claim a portion of it for herself and children, as a settlement to secure her against the bad luck or bad management of her husband. This 'equity to a settlement' was at first only allowed in cases where the husband had to seek the intervention of the Courts in his own behalf, and where, in return for the assistance rendered him, they felt themselves in a position to insist on his acting equitably. Afterwards, however, they enlarged their jurisdiction; and now, in all cases in which property accrues to the wife after marriage, she is entitled, on application, to a share of it in settlement, if adequate provision has not been previously made, or if other circumstances warrant it; but if the property once gets into the husband's hands, the Courts are powerless.

The Courts of Equity have thus by a series of slow and awkward steps, and by resorting to clumsy legal fictions, managed to a large extent to enable wealthy people to avoid the consequences of the vicious old common law. The common law relation between husband and wife has been so far set aside, and instead of it has been substituted a very different relation between wife and husband. The question irresistibly arises upon this state of facts,—why for the wealthy only? why not for the poor? If the common law is nullifiable in this matter for the convenience of the rich, why should it be maintained at all to the disadvantage of the poor and unprotected woman?

Even, however, for the wealthy, a change in the law is desirable, because the marriage settlement system is not only cumbrous and clumsy, but it is far from being completely just. In cases, for example, where a wife is allowed an equity to a settlement in respect of property coming to her after marriage, the whole sum is not given to the wife, as it ought to be, but a portion of it is devoted to the husband or to his creditors or assignees. This is so, even in cases where he is living apart from his wife; and should it happen that the property has got into his hands, the Courts are unable to apply a remedy. Again, in the case of married women's contracts, the Equity Courts recognise her right to contract with reference to her separate estate; but they do not allow her a general right to make contracts, because that would be contrary to the common law doctrine that a married woman has no such power. Thus arise various anomalous and unsatisfactory restrictions.

'Thus where written contracts are made by a married woman, the Courts presume that they are made with reference to her separate estate, but they do not

make this presumption in the case of debts orally contracted, as by orders for goods, in which case unless the separate estate is mentioned at the time of the contract, there is no remedy against it; and it has been further indicated, as a consequence of this doctrine, that contracts with reference to a wife's separate estate, are in the nature of appointments of that estate, and that creditors of this kind rank not equally with one another, but according to priorities of time. It also appears that the means of recovering against the estate of a married woman, through the process of equity, are very expensive and unsatisfactory, and often lead to a denial of justice.' \*

Sometimes, too, it occurs that, through accident or remissness, no settlement has been made; and then the improvidence, ill-conduct, or misfortune of the husband strips the wife of the whole of her own property.

And whilst thus the existing system of circumventing the common law fails to do all it ought to do for the wealthy, it is, from its expensiveness, quite beyond the reach of persons of small means, whose property, however little it may be, is of just as much importance to them as is the larger hoard to the affluent. Why should that be retained as a fundamental principle of law, which the Courts of Equity are constantly doing their utmost to set aside? And why should a yoke, which the rich are enabled to throw off, be fastened without remedy on the necks of the humbler classes? In short, why one law for the rich and another for the poor?

The law which gives the wife's earnings to her husband works much hardship. In many cases the husband lives on his wife, and spends his hours in dissipation. Mr. G. W. Hastings, in his evidence before the Select Committee, spoke of a number of such cases which had been laid before him. There were women whose husbands lived in drunkenness, and, very often, kept mistresses, entirely on the earnings of their wives. A married Irish lady had perpetual leasehold property producing about £2,000 a year; her husband sold and spent the produce of her leaseholds, then deserted her, and she had to earn her living in London by making artificial flowers. A widow, whose husband, a tradesman, had left her the whole of his property, married a widower, and whilst so doing had no idea that she was endowing him with all her worldly goods, and did not find out the truth until he had taken the whole of her property. Had she known the state of the law, she might have secured herself by marriage settlement; and had the law been as it should have been, it would have given her, as a matter of course, the protection which her ignorance rendered so necessary. One of the most common cases of hardship is that of women of the weekly wage class, and of those a little

---

\* Special Report from the Select Committee on Married Women's Property Bill. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed.

above them, such as milliners, who have saved money previous to their marriage. The smallness of the amount places a marriage settlement out of the question ; and the consequence is that the husband sweeps all away immediately. Thus a lady's maid saved money through ten or twelve years of service ; she married ; her husband got possession of her money, spent it all in profligacy, then deserted her, and went off to the Brazils with another woman. The lady whose servant she had been, becoming acquainted with her sad case, took compassion on her and set her up as a milliner at Torquay ; a good business was got together, and upwards of £100 were placed in the savings' bank as the result of her toil. The husband returning from the Brazils, found out the state of the case, went to the bank, claimed the whole of the money, took it out, and went back to the Brazils with it to the woman with whom he was living. This occurred, it is true, before the law was altered so as to protect the earnings of married women whose husbands have deserted them. But even yet the new law only applies in cases where the husband absolutely and for two years deserts the wife ; and there is nothing in it to prevent the husband from living upon his wife's earnings, going away for a month or twenty months at a time with another woman, and then returning and snatching the wages which his unhappy wife had earned. Mr. A. Hobhouse, Q.C., told the Select Committee that he had known some most cruel cases of the kind. One he mentioned was of a married woman in service, having an idle and dissipated husband, who could not be considered to have deserted her, she being in service, and against whom, therefore, she could not obtain any legal protection. Every twelve months or so, he came and swept away every farthing that his thrifty wife had managed to lay by. The Rev. Septimus Hansard narrated the case of a woman who had saved a little money in preparation for the time of her confinement, and whose husband actually took from her all the little hoard, and left her destitute. Mr. Mansfield, the police magistrate, spoke of the case of the widow of a master carter at Liverpool, who was married to her late husband's foreman. Very shortly after the marriage the husband dissipated the property, which was considerable, and so grossly ill-treated her that the intervention of the magistrate became necessary. 'Of course,' added this witness, 'if the property had remained in the wife, the foreman would have behaved properly ; his conduct would have been as good after his marriage as it was before ; the property would not have been dissipated, and the wife would not have been reduced to the workhouse, which she was.'

Another witness, Mr. Mundella, now M.P. for Sheffield, gave the Committee one or two instances in point. He knew a woman who was married to a widower with one child ; to that child she was very kind, and she has, in fact, brought it up. When married to this man she had a good home of her own, and yet the wretch has persecuted and neglected her, and his drunken conduct has been so bad as to compel her to take her furniture and go away with his child. That man has gone to her house while she has been away at work, and would repeatedly have sold the goods had not the neighbours interposed obstacles to prevent him from making off with the whole of her property. Another case known to Mr. Mundella, is that of an excellent woman, whose husband, acting on the principle of killing no murder, has only stopped short of that crime in his cruel and abominable treatment of her. Driven away by his brutality, she managed to get a little home of her own together again ; and five years ago she had a legacy left her, which would have made her very comfortable if she could but have received it. The trustees, however, were not able to pay it without her husband's signature, and so she had to forego its possession, and still lacks it, knowing that if her husband came to hear of it, he would inevitably seize it. Mr. Mundella knows a number of cases of women who marry early, and often earn as much as the man ; aware that he can help himself to their earnings, the husband neglects work and becomes dissipated ; the maintenance of the family thus falls upon the woman ; and on Saturday, when she takes home her earnings, the man deprives her of most or all of these, and spends the money in drink. 'It is lamentable,' says Mr. Mundella, 'to what an extent the earnings of women are often dissipated by bad husbands, and they have no protection.'

It has been suggested that cases of this nature might be met by an extension of the law now to some extent protecting deserted wives, so as to apply to women whose husbands are intemperate, reckless, idle, or cruel. But this would, in fact, be a very insufficient remedy, because few women, while continuing to live with their husbands, would come forward to claim such protection, and therewith make their domestic grievances public ; and because, again, in many cases the protection would come too late when the woman did at length make up her mind to obtain it. Long before it would be possible to get the protection order, the wife's savings would be swept off. To give labouring women an absolute property in and control over their own earnings and savings, would be conferring an unspeakable benefit. And it is worthy of note that there are proofs that if the better class of working men

had the making of the law, they would legislate in this sense. This is shown at Rochdale, in the famous Equitable Pioneer Co-operative Society, which consists almost exclusively of working men and women. Married women are not only allowed to be members on their own behalf, but their investments are guarded by the rules so that their husbands cannot withdraw them. Of course, if the husbands chose to be troublesome, it would be difficult to resist their claim, so long as the law of the land remains as it is. It would relieve the directors of much annoyance, and would tend to encourage provident habits in wives, if the law were changed. Mr. Ormerod, who was president of the society when before the Select Committee, said distinctly that in all cases the society does, with the assent of the directors, who are working men, give married women a separate property in their shares; he has never known or heard tell of any refusal on the part of the directors to give all the protection they can to married women having money in the society, and when the question has been mooted the members have never demurred to it.

Against all changes, however promisingly beneficial, our cautious instincts naturally rise up; and the ponderous conservatism of this country is so powerful, that it is not at all likely that those who advocate an amendment of the law affecting the earnings and property of married women, would be considered judicious any time on this side the twenty-first century, were it not that other communities, less afraid of change, have altered the law, and do rejoicingly adhere to the alteration. It is a fact that throughout the greater number of the United States, and in the dominion of Canada, the English common law on this subject has been repealed, and women, after marriage, now retain their separate property, with power to contract, and to sue and be sued in respect of it, just as if they were single. So strong has been the opinion in favour of this change in some of the more recently constituted Western States, that it has actually been made part of the State constitution, so as to be unrepealable except with much greater deliberation than is necessary for ordinary laws of the States.

The commencement of the change was in Vermont, in 1840; and other States soon followed the example. New York State, in 1848, gave married women control over their own property, but did not extend the protection to their earnings till 1860, and then it wholly repealed the common law. The date of the change in Massachusetts was 1857; in Upper Canada, 1859. This amendment of the law is stated by the witnesses to have been everywhere beneficial. An

ex-governor of Massachusetts, Mr. Washburn, now Professor of Law at Harvard University, who opposed the change with the apprehension that it would cause angry and unkind feelings in families, and open the door for fraud, now admits that he is so far convinced to the contrary that he would not restore the common law if he could. In short, the alteration has given entire satisfaction. None of the evils suggested as likely to flow from it have been observed. It has not caused dissension in families, nor weakened the proper authority of husbands, nor given rise to frauds to any noteworthy extent. It has lessened the number, but it has not abolished, marriage settlements. Where a woman owning much property is about to be married, trustees are still empowered to act for her benefit, as of yore; and in devises by will careful fathers still are found making a corresponding provision where the amount of bequest is considerable. It is to women of small fortunes that the chief benefit has accrued in America,—to whom a provision by marriage settlement through trustees was not open on account of the expense and difficulty, but who are now made equally secure with no trouble and expense to themselves. In America the number of such women is very large, whereas married women earning wages are comparatively rare. These exist more commonly in the manufacturing towns of Massachusetts, and there the new law is found to work admirably. It has ‘brought to the women of the poorer classes,’ says Mr. Wells, judge of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, ‘a relief which touches the springs of hope and energy, and which, I believe, will affect their lives to a degree far beyond any influence that can be felt through property merely by those who are the fortunate possessors of pecuniary wealth.’

The law has not been altered in exactly the same degree in all the States that have welcomed its amendment. In Massachusetts the wife is debarred from selling real estate or shares in corporations without the consent of her husband, the husband retains his right to the personality of the wife if she dies without having made a will, and the courts of law having held that the wife could not be in partnership with her husband, the Legislature has enacted that she cannot be a partner with any third person, and that if she wishes to carry on any trade apart from her husband she must register herself as a separate trader, in due form. This restriction, however, does not apply to the case of simple earnings. The liability of the husband for his wife’s debts still remains as before. In the State of New York the change has been more sweeping. Even real estate may be sold by the wife without her husband’s consent; and she seems to be at liberty to

enter into partnership or to carry on a separate trade. Yet the common law in New York, as in Massachusetts, still remains unrepealed as regards husband and wife taking property by gift, grant, or conveyance from each other, or contracting with or suing one another upon contracts or for torts. In Upper Canada the change resembles that in New York, except that it has not been yet extended to earnings. The old French law of Lower Canada, under which great facilities were given to married women to obtain *séparation des biens* by simple declaration before a notary at marriage, had worked so well that it contributed greatly to the change of the English common law in Upper Canada.

Fortified by abundant and most reliable testimony as to the excellent results of the change in America, the Select Committee have reported altogether favorably to it. They say :—

'Your Committee attribute much weight to the evidence from those States because, where so great a change of law is proposed, the arguments as to the results must necessarily be of a theoretical character, unless they can be drawn from experience; and if in countries with populations so similar in every respect to that of this country, with the same laws up to a recent period, and where the same complaints were made against the operation of it, the common law has been changed without difficulty, and without causing those evils which were anticipated there, and which are feared here, there is every reason to believe that those fears are groundless, and that the same good results will follow in this country. Among the working classes the number of women earning wages is so much greater than in the United States, that there is good reason to believe the results of the change will be even more satisfactory, in so far as they will extend to so many more persons.'

'Looking, therefore, to the result of this experience, and to the general tendency of the provisions of equity, your Committee is of opinion that a change in the law of this country, with reference both to the property and earnings of married women, is necessary.'

But then comes the question, whether any alteration should be made in the liability of a husband to maintain his wife in consequence of such a change in the law regarding the property of married women? The Committee conclude that such alteration is not necessary :—

'A married woman living with her husband has an authority which, in spite of some fluctuation and uncertainty of judicial decisions, seems to be regulated by the general principles of the law of agency. Agency is a mixed question of law and fact, and the Courts will give due weight to such a fact as the possession of property by a married woman without any express statutory directions.'

Questions still remain which the Committee have not felt themselves able to dispose of thus summarily, or at all. For instance :—Should the poor-law liability of the father for the maintenance of the children be extended to the mother? Should the change in the law be confined to future marriages only, or should it be applied, as it has been in Upper Canada,

to existing marriages, where after-acquired property is concerned ? Should the restrictions in alienation of property by the wife, which the Massachusetts code imposes, be adopted in this country ? Should the wife's power to contract, convey, and take by conveyance, be extended to contracts with, or conveyances to or from, her husband, or be limited to third parties as appears to be the case in some of the American States ? Again : On the death of the wife without having made a will, should any part of her personal property go to her next of kin, or the whole to her husband ? These questions the Committee cautiously felt that they had not had time to discuss thoroughly before the close of the Session compelled them to report their proceedings ; and they have left at the end of their report a recommendation that a Select Committee be appointed in the new Session of Parliament to pursue those points of inquiry.

Not seeing any real necessity for postponing action, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Headlam, and Mr. Jacob Bright have just brought in a Bill to amend the law with respect to the property of married women. It proposes that married women shall be capable of holding property, of contracting, of suing and of being sued, equally with single women. Property acquired after the Act has come into operation by women married before that time, is to be held by them as if they had remained unmarried. The earnings of a married woman are to be her personal estate. A husband is not to be liable for his wife's debts contracted before marriage, nor in damages for any wrong committed by her. Upon the death of a wife intestate, her husband is to take the same distributive share in her personal estate as a wife would take in the personal estate of her husband if he died intestate. The right of any husband to hold his wife's real estate as tenant by courtesy is not to be interfered with. Disputes between husband and wife as to personal property are to be decided in a summary way, either party being allowed to apply to any Chancery or county court judge, who will be empowered to make any order that he may think fit. If a wife has allowed her husband to receive the rents and profits of her personal estate, the husband is not to be held liable to account for them. The Act is to come into operation on the first of January next, and is not to extend to Scotland. It has our cordial wishes for its success.

---

## ROBERT FALCONER.

**A**S an earnest teacher of that which is now to be called 'The Enthusiasm of Humanity,' George Macdonald stands, perhaps, unrivalled among the novelists of to-day.

The book before us is in his best style, and has the remarkable merit of at once avoiding the insipidities of an ordinary novel, and of maintaining, with almost no plot, the reader's interest unabated even to the last chapter. The faults which in our eyes stain most of the novels of the age, are not entirely absent from 'Robert Falconer.' The example set by Mrs. Gaskell, and followed only too willingly by her successors, George Eliot and others, has apparently been too powerful in its influence over Mr. Macdonald for him to withstand and deviate from. We hold, as a first principle, that for all true teachers of mankind the setting forth of truth, beauty, and purity is at once the noblest and the surest way of advancing that 'Enthusiasm of Humanity' which such teachers as Mr. Madonald adopt for their creed. It is, doubtless, continually argued, in reply to such strictures, that an artist must be true to nature; that he must paint the dark as well as the bright side of that human nature which it is his purpose to delineate;—that if he finds corruption, whether in the palace or the cottage, he must paint it, gibbeting it as best he may, showing its vileness to the utmost of his power, but still not suppressing, but setting it forth. We, however, would still urge that with the poet, and such in truth the novelist claims to be, especially the prophet-novelist, like our author, truth and beauty, the lessons he has to teach, must ever stand in his estimation far higher than the work of the mere artist recording just what he sees. Just as we read in the days of our childhood in that ancient child's book, 'Evenings at Home,' that the young artist was not to occupy himself with the study of 'lucus naturæ,' such as the duck standing on one leg, so the poet-artist, who has a true realisation of the holiness of his vocation, will see it his duty, as did the preacher of old, to commend himself and his work, not by manifestation of the false, of the corrupt, of the odious, but 'by manifestation of the truth,' to every reader's conscience.

The sketch of Robert's boyhood and early youth under the care, we might almost say surveillance, of his pious but austere grandmother, is one which for dramatic power of treatment must needs hold a high place in our memory of the story. The incessant strain of the boy-nature with its poetical tendencies against the repressive government system adopted

by the grandmother, itself a legitimate outcome of the high-toned, yet somewhat narrow religious training in which she had grown up, is delineated with a power of insight into the boy-character worthy of our most able dramatists ; while the ever-recurring, never absent background shadow of the dis-honoured son and father, the intended quest for whom becomes the guiding idea of Robert's every thought, haunts the reader scarcely less than the image of her 'Anerew' does the grandmother.

In one respect, however, we must doubt whether our author has not made of 'Robert' an unreal character, and that is in his intense love of, and insight into, the poetry of nature. We believe that all revelation of the unseen, whether in the world of spirit or of imagination, comes to man through human channels. It does not appear to us possibly true that a boy, living like Robert in a small country town, which Rotheden clearly is, with nature close to him and familiar to him from his childhood, should, because he goes a few miles out of this village-town to spend a fortnight at his farmer-uncle's, become so responsive as he does to the voices of nature, without the intervention of any human soul to open and unlock to him that closed door. To a child who has never seen the sun shine on green fields and waving tree-boughs, such a revelation may be, nay is, not impossible; but we believe our experience in this respect will be endorsed by other observers of boy-nature, that to the country-bred boy such a revelation comes not direct, but ever by transmission from some inspired human soul.

And here we must note another—shall we say weakness ? in our author. Music has, indeed, a remarkable power over his hero, and it is through its teaching that nature's voices speak to him ; but really the large part which Mr. Macdonald makes music to take in the salvation, regeneration, and elevation of nearly all his principal characters does sometimes almost provoke a smile. It is the saving of Mysie and of 'Anerew,' the one redeeming quality of 'the soutar,' and a quasi-halo of glory around Miss St. John.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not 'sneer,' as Mr. Macdonald says, 'at the notion of making the violin a ministering spirit in the process of conversion.' Oh, no ; we can well understand its value in such special cases as 'Anerew's,' but it is hardly to be supposed that so many persons should be similarly affected in one small circle, such as that presented to us in these volumes.

It is, however, most encouraging that this intense musical passion, which both hero and heroine share, should fail to

interfere with the life-work to which they afterwards so zealously betake themselves, and even still more remarkable that the music passion seems almost to fade away out of this earnest life, which London finds for them.

All these, however, are merely minor flaws, say rather sun-gilt motes, which detract in no degree from the beauty of the narrative, and the thrilling earnestness of the chief actors.

The shock-headed Shargar must not be passed unnoticed by. The part he occupies in the tale is an unwonted, yet an interesting one. The process by which he grows from being merely Robert's shadow, or his faithful dog, to be the self-centred man, the Major Moray, himself fulfilling the one novel-like part of the novel, is an admirable study in itself.

To us, however, we must confess this book has its chief interest from its mode of dealing with social questions, but for which we had found no place for it in these pages. In every word of Mr. Macdonald's on this subject, we feel that he abundantly recognises the truth of Mrs. Browning's teaching :—

‘Even so  
I hold you will not compass your poor ends  
Of barley-feeding and material ease,  
Without a poet’s individualism  
To work your universal. It takes a soul  
To move a body : it takes a high-souled man,  
To move the masses...even to a cleaner styre :  
It takes the ideal, to blow a hair’s-breadth-off  
The dust of the actual.—Ah ! your Fouriers failed  
Because not poets enough to understand  
That life develops from within.’

Again :—

‘Tis impossible  
To get at men excepting through their souls,  
However open their carnivorous jaws ;  
And poets get directlier at the soul  
Than any of your economists :—for which  
You must not overlook the poet’s work  
When scheming for the world’s necessities.  
The soul’s the way. Not even Christ himself  
Can save man else than as He holds man’s soul ;  
And therefore did He come into our flesh.’

And, so far, such a book as this is most invaluable, as showing that the regeneration of the masses cannot be wrought out by any rough and ready method of ‘improved dwellings for the people,’ or any other mere ‘soap-and-water’ or scavenger’s cleansing,—but must be by the Christ-like method of personal touch and contact of the truly living soul, with the downward-drawn but still restorable ‘human form divine.’

But we must let Mr. Macdonald here speak for himself :—

'Thus did Falconer appoint a sorrow-made infidel to be the almoner of his Christian charity, knowing well that the nature of the Son of Man was in him, and that to get him to do as the Son of Man did, in ever so small a degree, was the readiest means of bringing his higher nature to the birth.'—Vol. iii., p. 101.

Again :—

'What, then, is a man to do for the poor? How is he to work with God?' I asked.

'He must be a man among them—a man breathing the air of a higher life, and therefore in all natural ways fulfilling his endless human relations to them. Whatever you do for them, let your own being, that is, you in relation to them, be the background, that so you may be a link between them and God, or rather, I should say, between them and the knowledge of God.'

Again, Falconer asks a would-be disciple :—

'Could you look upon loathsomeness . . . without losing your belief in the Fatherhood of God, by losing your faith in the actual blood-relationship to yourself of these wretched beings? Could you believe in the immortal essence hidden under all this garbage—God at the root of it all?' 'And then the time you must spend before you can lay hold upon them at all, that is, with the personal relation which alone is of any real influence.' 'Not under any circumstances could I consent to make use of you before you had brought yourself into genuine relations with some of them first.'

But we need not multiply extracts. The above will sufficiently show the character of 'Robert Falconer' as a 'social worker.' What strikes us most strangely is, that a man should be pictured as so earnest in the work, and so plunged in the seething whirlpool of London misery, as recognising the value of law in the minor matter of dwellings for the poor, and yet apparently, as failing to recognise the great cause of all this misery, in the midst of which he worked, in the law-provided liquor-traffic.

Passages, indeed, we have, which show that Mr. MacDonald's eyes have not been closed to the horrors of the public-house system. Thus :—

'What better life could steam up from such a Phlegethon! Look there, "Cream of the Valley!" As if the mocking serpent must, with sweet words of Paradise, deepen the horrors of the hellish compound, to which so many of our own brothers and sisters, made in the image of God, fly as to their only saviour from the misery of feeling alive.'

Moreover, we find all through the book—as how could we otherwise?—the whisky or the gin doing its dreadful work, transforming into hideous perversions of humanity, men and women made in the image of God. And yet, though seeing the curse which the drink was working, we find the man and his friend taking their 'glass of wine' before issuing forth to redeem their fellow-creatures from the woe wrought by the spirit of the same liquor. Strange inconsistency! and the stranger, because on some points the man does see so plainly.

Thus, for his father, for instance, he feels the need of absolute prohibition, and when he leaves him at Bodyfauld, only does so on condition that Mr. Lammie's house shall for the time become 'prohibition territory.' Strange that in the whole book there is no hint of the idea that what was good for his father and Mr. Lammie's household in Scotland, might prove equally beneficial for his many poor friends in London, and their sober neighbours around them.

To us, as opponents of the drink traffic, that picture of Mr. Lammie, 'ganging to mak the twa boatles o' whisky an' the midden weel acquaint,' is as joyful a one as any in the book.

Oh! for a law to send all the 'whisky' and its fraternity in the same direction!

---

#### THE LICENSING LAWS AND PROPOSALS FOR THEIR AMENDMENT.

THERE are few subjects so intricate as our licensing system, if system it may be called. Enactment after enactment has been made, establishing such a variety of licences, that very few persons are acquainted with all the conditions under which the privilege to sell intoxicating drinks can be obtained, or with the laws which are in force for the regulation of the trade. There is only one thing in connection with the system on which all persons seem to be agreed, namely, that the result of all the laws has been most unsatisfactory. All classes of the community are loud in their complaints, and proposals for amendment are being brought forward on every hand. The magistrates all over the country and the judges of the highest courts, the convocation of the province of Canterbury and the conference of the Primitive Methodists, the members of the United Kingdom Alliance and of the Licensed Victuallers' Protection Societies, the Association for the Promotion of Social Science and the numerous associations scattered over all the land for the avowed object of amending the licensing laws, all declare unanimously that the present incongruous mass of inconsistent enactments produces confusion and uncertainty in the administration of the law, and promotes rather than diminishes intemperance and its attendant evils. We do not intend in the present article to enter upon a consideration of the amount of the evil which does exist among us; we will assume, unhesitatingly, that our readers are well aware of its extent and deplore

it sincerely ; we shall take for granted that all desire to remove what all regret ; and believing that what is really needed is a fair statement of the law as it at present stands and of the remedies proposed, we shall attempt as impartially as possible to describe the existing confusion, and to point out the nature of the proposals made for its removal.

We do not dare to enter into a history of the licensing system of this country beyond the reign of William IV. Prior to his day the only licensed retailers of beer, wine, and spirits held their privilege under the bill known as 9 Geo. IV., c. 61, the object of which, according to its preamble, was 'to reduce into one act the laws relating to the licensing by justices of the peace of persons keeping, or being about to keep, inns, alehouses, and victualling-houses to sell excisable liquors by retail, to be drunk or consumed on the premises.' This act repealed somewhere about twenty-one previous acts in force up to the year 1828, and has been ever since the statute under which the magistrates have granted certificates to the applicants who came before them, on which the Excise have been empowered to confer the privilege of selling intoxicating liquors. Every one is aware that under this act general licensing meetings are held annually, and at least four meetings for transferring licences every year. At these meetings 'any question touching the granting, withholding, or transferring any licence, or the fitness of the person applying for such licence, or of the house intended to be kept by such person, shall be determined by the majority of the justices present.' The persons receiving certificates from the magistrates at the brewster sessions can, on payment of the appointed fees, take out licences from the Excise for the sale of spirits and other excisable liquors. Some few only take a beer licence, though they may have the more extended privilege if they wish it. The licensed houses are allowed to be open for the sale of drinks except on certain hours on Sundays, Christmas Day, and Good Friday, or any day appointed for a public fast or thanksgiving day. By the 'Permissive Public House Closing Act of 1864,' which has been adopted in about eighty localities, all places for the sale of drink or refreshment are closed from one o'clock a.m. to four. Various penalties are also enacted for breaches of the conditions of the licence, such as permitting drunkenness or the assembling of disorderly characters, the use of any but standard measures, the adulteration of liquors, the sale of drink in prohibited hours, the permission of gambling, &c. For a first offence a penalty not exceeding five pounds is imposed ; for a second offence a sum not exceeding ten

pounds ; for a third offence the fine is increased to a sum not exceeding fifty pounds ; while, if the justices should in their discretion remit this charge to the general or quarter sessions to be tried before a jury, the penalty, on the accused being found guilty, is increased to one hundred pounds, and the licence may be adjudged to be void, and its holder incapable of selling excisable liquors by retail for three years from the time of such adjudication. It is under this act that all the places which retail spirits and wines for consumption on the premises are licensed, except those kept by free vintners of London, who do not require a licence for the sale of wines.

The action of this law was considered so unsatisfactory, and so much intemperance prevailed in the country, that in the year 1830 the Beerhouses' Act was passed, by which, without having recourse to the justices, houses were licensed by the Excise for the sale of beer only, it being hoped that the introduction of facilities for obtaining a milder beverage would lessen the consumption of spirits, and that the removal of the licensing from the magistrates would diminish the partisanship and jobbery with which those gentlemen were charged. Before this act had been in force many months, the evils arising from it were so great, that it was so far amended that only houses of a certain rateable value are now permitted to receive licences, and in places with a population under 5,000 a certificate of six persons rated at £6 and upwards, as to the character of the applicant, is required. The holders of beerhouse licences are under severer restrictions than licensed victuallers as to hours of sale, but the penalties upon breaches of the tenour of licences are the same as those imposed upon the spirit dealers, with the exception that the penalty for a first offence does not exceed £2, and that there is no clause like that which enables the magistrates to send the consideration of the third offence to quarter sessions, so that the fine is not to exceed £50, though the licence may be declared void.

In addition to these two classes of houses for the sale of intoxicating beverages, refreshment-houses may now be licensed for the sale of wine to be consumed on the premises, and grocers, &c., may obtain licences to sell for consumption off the premises. The permission is granted by the Excise on receipt of a magisterial certificate that certain formal conditions have been complied with. There is no discretion granted to the bench as in the case of applicants for a spirit licence.

We have not, in our enumeration of the variety of licences existing, alluded as yet to the wholesale licences, nor do we intend to enter into their consideration except to point out

that, under a late act, wholesale dealers may by a small additional fee obtain a retail licence for sale for consumption off the premises. This applies to the sale of beer as well as of spirits, and several cases are reported where under cover of this licence men have entered the trade who were unable to comply with the requirements of the ordinary Beer Act. To add to the confusion, occasional licences can under certain circumstances be obtained for the sale of excisable liquors at fairs, races, &c.

We have thus briefly enumerated the different laws regulating the licensing of houses for the sale of all kinds of intoxicating drinks, without entering into any discussion of their relative merits. There is, however, one feature in the magisterial licence which ought not to be overlooked, as it adds very materially to the chaos which our want of system inevitably produces. The members of the bench have unlimited discretion as to their votes. They may grant or withhold a licence with or without reason. Political prejudice, a desire of exercising personal patronage, or gratifying a personal dislike, the highest philanthropy, or any other motive may actuate them. They may think it right to consider the requirements of the neighbourhood, or believe that such a consideration is not to be taken into account. They may flood a town with spirit shops, as the Liverpool bench did during several years, or may keep down the number or reduce it, as they have done in Manchester. By their action they may thus make the law have an altogether different operation in two neighbouring towns; they may change their plans from year to year, and thus produce an uncertainty as to its character, and greatly injure the respect in which it is desirable that the law should ever be held. And, further, as the applicant for a spirit licence has, if refused, the right of appeal to the quarter sessions, it may happen, indeed it has frequently happened, that a man who for very definite reasons has been refused his licence by the local justices, obtains it from the quarter sessions, the members of which cannot be equally good judges of the circumstances under which the application was made.

When we remember, in addition, that even if the ordinary brewster sessions refuse a spirit licence, and the quarter sessions confirm that refusal, a man can obtain a beerhouse licence and a wine licence, it is evident that the one great restriction upon the number of drinking-houses supposed to be in the good character of the licensee, is altogether done away with. It will, therefore, not be surprising that nearly every proposal for the amendment of the present law begins with

a demand for a repeal of the Beer and Wine Licensing Acts, or, as it may more generally be stated, by a proposal that there should be one authority only from whom all the various kinds of licences should proceed, and that this authority should have power to take the character of the applicants into consideration with other circumstances.

The Beerhouse Licensing System Amendment Association, of which Mr. Akroyd, the member for Halifax, is the treasurer, and the Rev. Wm. Stanyer, M.A., the hon. secretary, confines itself to the moderate proposition of repealing the Beer Act, and has at the present moment a bill before Parliament to that effect. There can be no doubt that if the Beer Act were repealed so as to prevent for the future the granting of any new licences, or at least to diminish the number, some slight good would be obtained; but so very small a portion of the evil would be touched, that we cannot even at the best look upon this proposal with very great hopefulness of the ultimate benefit to be derived from it. The bill brought in by Mr. Selwyn-Ibbetson expressly provides for the renewal of all existing licences granted prior to its passing. Allowing the magistrates no power to take the wants or requirements of the neighbourhood into their consideration of licences for consumption off the premises, can hardly be considered a measure which will give many fewer licences than the present system, except in cases where at present the Excise authorities wilfully transgress the law by licensing houses rated below the amount required by the act. The good features of the proposal are that less stringency is required in proof of various contraventions of the conditions of licence than at present. The advantages are, however, so small in the proposed amendment, that when the evils to be contended against are considered, we cannot help fearing that the passing of the bill will be a hindrance instead of a gain to an efficient reform of the licensing system. We shall have men demanding a fair trial, as it is called, before any further change be made. Its advocates also confirm a very erroneous impression current among to many of the magistrates—that they have not as efficient a control over the conduct of beerhouses as over that of public-houses licensed by the magistracy. The fact is that the powers which the magistrates do possess are rarely exercised. If the penalties which might be imposed were enforced to the limit assigned to them by the law, we should see a diminution in the number of beerhouses, and the remainder would be conducted with greater desire to comply with the tenour of the licence. It is a very rare thing indeed to see a fine of £10 imposed upon a beerhouse-keeper for a second offence,

or a £50 penalty imposed for a third offence. The report of the chief constable of Manchester records 668 cases of beerhouse-keepers convicted during the year ending September 29th, 1868, the total amount of fines imposed being £860. 10s., exclusive of costs, giving an average penalty of £1. 5s. 9d. to each case. There were, however, four cases of a fourth conviction, where the full penalty undoubtedly ought to have been imposed. This would have made £200. There are twenty-two cases of third convictions, which would have imposed penalties to the amount of £1,100. It is unnecessary to refer to the 110 cases of second offences in order to show that in Manchester, at least, the magistrates have not made use of the powers at present within their reach to ensure the good behaviour of the beerhouse-keepers; and we have every reason to believe that in this neglect Manchester is not worse than other towns. From the report of Lieutenant-General Cartwright, the inspector of the constabulary for the eastern and midland counties for the year ending 29th September, 1868, printed by order of the House of Commons, 19th February, 1869, we find that in those counties there were 8,656 beerhouses; that, against these, 940 prosecutions for offences against good order were conducted, resulting in 780 convictions; and yet only three licences were withdrawn. The tables do not give the number of times the houses proceeded against had offended, but we can hardly believe that only three were guilty for a third time. In 34 boroughs inspected by this gentleman there were 3,213 beerhouses, the number of prosecutions was 620, the convictions were 544, but not one single licence was withdrawn. Surely the law cannot have been enforced with anything like strictness here. There is, however, one point which ought not to be overlooked in considering this assertion of magisterial want of control. The fact that on a third offence the licence is void, would make the traders more careful if the bench were more severe. A publican is of course liable to lose his spirit licence on a third offence, but when he has forfeited it he can continue the sale of beer and wine under an Excise licence, but the beerhouse-keeper would have to find some other means of procuring a livelihood, if the law were rigorously enforced against him. We are told that the licensed victuallers' houses are so much more under magisterial control than the beerhouses, yet we do not find that their authority is exercised in a very formidable way. In the 17 counties reported upon by General Cartwright there are 13,978 public-houses; of these, 565 have been proceeded against, and 461 have been convicted; but only 37 have had their licences withdrawn.

In the 34 boroughs on which he reports, there are 4,595 public-houses ; against 303 proceedings have been taken, and 244 have been convicted, while only 6 have lost their licences. These figures do not suggest any very great activity on the part of the justices of the peace. The leniency of the bench towards such offenders makes many persons very doubtful whether the magistrates are the fittest authority in which to confide the power of regulating licences.

A new society—‘The National Association for Promoting Amendment in the Laws relating to the Liquor Traffic’—has lately been established under the presidency of the Archbishop of York, which demands an immediate suspension of Excise licensing, and further asks for measures of restriction to limit the facilities of intemperance. This scheme, inasmuch as it immediately stops the multiplication of beer-houses, is an improvement upon the older society to which we have just referred, but it is impossible to say anything as to its practical usefulness, in consequence of the further restrictive measures which it desires to see enforced being as yet undeclared.

A more definite scheme was introduced into the House of Lords by the Earl of Lichfield. This measure, however well intended, would, if carried, be rather a means of stricter police supervision than an amendment of the licensing system. The chief features of reform which it proposed were, a change in the method of granting beer and wine licences, almost identical with that proposed by Mr. Selwyn-Ibbetson’s bill, which would therefore continue the mischief of excessive temptations instead of materially lessening the number, and the introduction of a clause, granting to owners of property the right of objecting, though not of vetoing, the issue of a licence within a certain radius of their property. Very many police regulations were, however, introduced into this bill which would have raised a host of objections, and some of them well founded ones. We do not see how, e.g., the clause which prohibited working men from entering public-houses during the ordinary hours of labour could be defended against the charge of being class legislation. Lord Lichfield has, however, joined the society presided over by the Archbishop of York, and we therefore hope that, if he again introduces a Licensing Amendment Bill, it will be a more thoroughgoing scheme than the one which he last brought before the Peers.

A far more extensive proposal for reform is made by the Licence Amendment League, founded last October in Birmingham, which has its head-quarters, however, in Manchester, and has the advantage of possessing in Dr. Martin a

most earnest and unwearied hon. secretary. We subjoin his statement of the objects of the league, together with the reform it suggests :

**FIRST.—*The amendment of the Beer and Wine Licensing Acts.***

- a* Abolition of Excise licensing.
- b* Magistrates to form the sole licensing authority.
- c* No appeal from the decision of the local magistrates.

**SECOND.—*Diminution of the present facilities for obtaining new licences.***

- a* By increase of rating and rental qualifications.
- b* By giving to owners and occupiers of adjacent property a local *veto*.
- c* By giving to town councils, &c., a general *veto*.

**THIRD.—*Diminution of the present provocatives to drunkenness.***

- a* Sunday drinking.—Town councils, boards of commissioners, &c., to have the power of closing public-houses, &c., during the whole of Sunday.
- b* Early and late drinking.—Town councils, &c., to be empowered to order the closing of public-houses, &c., during the week, from 10 or 11 p.m. till 7 a.m.

(Where there is not a local board elected by the ratepayers, these powers to be exercised by the magistrates.)

**FOURTH.—*To establish special checks to drunkenness.***

- a* By prohibiting the opening of gin-palaces.
- b* By prohibiting the opening of music or dancing saloons, except under magisterial licence.
- c* By rendering it an offence to allow workmen to remain drinking during ordinary working hours.
- d* A husband to have power to prohibit publicans, or others, from supplying his wife with liquor.
- e* Magistrates to have power to prohibit publicans, or others, from supplying notorious drunkards with liquor.

**FIFTH.—*To give greater protection to young persons.***

- a* Publicans, or others, prohibited from supplying liquors to any young person under eighteen years of age in any licensed house.
- b* No female under the age of twenty-one years to be employed as a waitress in any licensed house.
- c* No person under twenty-one years of age to be allowed to enter any singing or dancing saloon connected with a public-house, &c.

No doubt if some of the amendments proposed by this association could be carried, they would very materially improve our present condition. We are, however, very far from convinced that the magistrates are the best licensing authority which could be found. The discretion entrusted to them has frequently been used very indiscreetly, and the fact that they are an irresponsible body of men makes the placing of so great a power in their hands so absolutely as it would be under these proposals, a matter deserving of very serious consideration. The plan of increasing the rental and rating qualifications of houses applying for new licences is a very excellent one, as it would limit the area in which the discretionary power of the licensing authority could be exercised, and by making the licensee invest more capital in his business, it would impose greater caution on the conduct of the publican, as the deprivation of his licence would be a proportionally greater loss. The local

veto which is claimed for owners and occupiers of adjacent property is distinctly a step in the direction of a thorough remedy for the evils of the public-house system, and, as we shall try to show further on, a very legitimate means to be adopted. We are not quite so sure that giving to town councils, &c., a general veto is equally effective. No doubt this suggestion is derived in part from the Right Hon. John Bright's remark in the debate on the second reading of the Permissive Bill in 1864, when he recommended the transfer of the licensing power to the municipal councils, and advocated entrusting the full veto power to the representatives of the ratepayers as preferable to putting it to the direct vote. Mr. Bright subsequently stated that he did not urge the proposal with much confidence, as the case was full of difficulties. We fear that municipal elections would be exposed to additional dangers of corruption if the Town Councils were to become the licensers of public-houses, or to have the power of veto. As it is, there are so many questions of local interest which have to be considered in the selection of men for municipal duties, that the important question of licensing might be overlooked by those interested in other subjects, while the persons interested in the trade in drink would always be alive to the importance of securing men favourable to their traffic, so that the indirect control first suggested by Mr. Bright, and adopted with modification by the Licence Amendment League, would be very far short of being so effective as its advocates would desire.

Several of the special checks suggested under the fourth and fifth heads would no doubt be very beneficial, but others are open to the objections which we urged against similar proposals in Lord Lichfield's act, and seem to raise unnecessary difficulties in the way of any practical scheme of licence amendment.

Several of the suggestions contained in the programme of this league were embodied in the bill which a few sessions ago was introduced into the House of Commons by the member for Liverpool. This act was the result of an experiment which had been tried in that town for several years, by the rather singular interpretation given to the 9 Geo. IV., c. 61, by some of the most active members of the local magistracy. Believing that the intention of the Legislature had not been to consult what are technically known as 'the requirements of the neighbourhood,' licences had been granted to all applicants of good character who occupied houses suited to the trade in liquors. The number of spirit shops had thus been very greatly increased in Liverpool, so that while in most other towns the beerhouses exceeded the spirit shops in

number, the proportion was there reversed. We do not wish to go into the often repeated tale of Liverpool drunkenness. Suffice it to say that the experiment was so fruitful of evil results, that although some of its defenders still maintain that it was not tried quite long enough, more moderate counsels prevailed at the brewster sessions, and the ordinary interpretation of the act was adopted after a severe and prolonged contest. The one fact, however, had become manifest to all persons, that laws which permitted such evils to exist as were seen in Liverpool, required amendment, and a joint committee of the borough magistrates and town council prepared a bill which was introduced, as we stated above, by the local members, but, meeting with Government opposition, based on technical grounds, it was withdrawn, on an implied understanding that the ministry would take up and deal with the whole question as soon as possible. The Liverpool Licensing Bill, which the *Licensed Victuallers' Guardian* described as 'seeking the hateful condition of Liverpool all over the kingdom, and making unusual efforts to swamp the respectable tradesmen, to ruin their property, and lower them in the social scale, as [sic] to convert the whole country into a similar fearful Eblis of misery and crime,' would perhaps meet with more lenient criticism at the hands of less interested critics. Its chief objects were to secure uniformity in the issue of licences, combined with restrictions that should by degrees lessen the number of houses and at once diminish the hours during which the sale could be carried on. The advantages were to be obtained by the immediate repeal of the Excise licensing powers, and by making the magistrates the sole licensing authority. The varying manner of the exercise of their discretion was to be put an end to by making it obligatory upon the bench to grant licences whenever certain conditions were complied with by the applicants. In order that the number of houses might not under such a rule be too much increased, a high rental was demanded for every house seeking a licence, and a largely increased fee was required, a certain amount of which was to be paid to the authorities of the locality, in aid of police expenses. A local veto was proposed to be given, by which three-fourths of the inhabitants and owners of adjacent property would be able to prevent the issue of new licences. A small reduction in the licence fee was to be made to such publicans as would consent to keep their houses closed on Sundays, and various increased restrictions were to be imposed upon the dealer in intoxicating drinks. One clause in the bill was inserted to quieten the fears of the present holders of

licences,—they were to have fourteen years' grace before the increased fees were to be demanded of them, but they were immediately to come under the police regulations imposed by the bill.

There can be no doubt that a system such as that sketched in the Liverpool bill would in very many places be a vast improvement upon the present chaos. The increased rating or rental demanded would amply counteract the evil caused by giving up the moral check which exists in the discretionary power of the magistrates, and when the years of grace had passed there would be a large diminution of the number of houses, the small public-houses and beershops being then unable to obtain new licences. Whether it would be worth while to purchase the advantage, together with the lessened hours of sale and the increased strictness of regulation by an indemnity of fourteen years, is, however, very questionable; and the veto clause was so small a boon as to be valuable chiefly as a concession of a principle which might ultimately lead to greater things. The bill was, however, withdrawn, and the promised Government bill is still only promised, the deputations which have lately waited upon Mr. Gladstone and the Home Secretary having only elicited the fact that no measure will be introduced by them this session, although the question is to be brought under the consideration of the cabinet. It does appear, however, from remarks made by Mr. Gladstone and by Mr. Bruce, that the provisions of the Liverpool bill will not be overlooked in framing any measure which will be brought forward with ministerial sanction.

The important question of licensing reform has not been overlooked by the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. At every meeting which it has held since its first congress at Birmingham, papers have been read upon the subject, and resolutions have been frequently sent up to the council for further deliberation. At the Belfast meeting (1867) a special committee was appointed, which gave very mature consideration to the whole question, and presented a very thoughtful report to the council of the Association, which after considerable debate was adopted by that body. At the last congress in Birmingham (1868), the report was considered in the section for the Suppression of Crime, presided over by Sir Walter Crofton, and the council was requested to press its consideration upon the attention of Parliament. The suggestions of this committee, after asserting that uniformity was greatly needed in the laws regulating the sale of drink, which are in the opinion of the committee in a very unsatisfactory condition, proceed as follows:—

'The manner in which houses are conducted where excisable liquors are sold by retail would appear naturally to depend on the character of the persons entrusted with the licences, the value of the premises in which the sale takes place, the hours during which they are open, and the number of such houses in a neighbourhood.

'It is therefore desirable that every precaution should be taken to ascertain the character of all persons applying for licences, that the houses are of sufficient value and proper for the business, and that there is a reasonable presumption that, if licensed, the occupants may, with industry and honest dealing, obtain a living.

'Your committee therefore recommend that all applications for licences to sell beer, spirits, wines, cider, or perry by retail be in the first instance made to the justices in petty sessions, after notice to the chief constable of the place and the other authorities now required by the 9 Geo. IV., c. 61, in respect of inns, alehouses, and victualling-houses; such notice to state the class of trade for which the applicant wishes to be licensed, i.e., hotel, inn, victualling-house, wine and spirit store, refreshment-rooms, or beerhouse; and the discretion at present exercised by justices in granting licences, shall be extended to all licences to be granted by them.

'That the value of houses to which licences should in future be granted (otherwise than by renewal) for the sale of beer by retail to be drunk on the premises be increased to double the value now required by the 1 Wm. IV., c. 64.

'That all licensed houses be closed on Sundays, but to prevent inconvenience to the public, justices, where they see fit, may, in their licence, permit houses to be opened on Sundays from one o'clock to three o'clock, and from eight o'clock to ten o'clock, p.m.

'That in the cases of innkeepers' licences, and where justices consider that the house is *bona fide* and reasonably required as an inn for the entertainment of travellers, the justices may accompany the grant of a licence with a dispensation as to hours, as to the whole or part of the house and premises, provided that such dispensation shall not apply to nor include any taproom, bar, or other place of public resort for drinking.

'That all applications for licences or renewals, or objections thereto, shall be heard in open court, and the witnesses, if necessary, may be examined on oath.

'That where application for a licence is made for the first time, if two-thirds of the owners or occupiers within five hundred yards object, the justices shall refuse the licence, provided that the clerk of the justices has received from the persons so objecting at least ten days' notice specifying the objection.

'That the right of appeal from the decision of the petty sessions be extended to persons objecting to licences being granted, and notice of appeal, to suspend the issue of the licences until after the decision of the sessions. The disqualification of justices under the 9 Geo. IV., c. 61, s. 27, to be repealed.

'That, with the view of preventing undue influence in the granting of licences, no clerk to justices shall be permitted to apply for, or support, or oppose, any application for a licence before the justices, under the penalty of forfeiture of his office of clerk.

'That when a person has had a licence granted him for new premises, and has within three years sold them for a premium, increase of rent, or other valuable consideration, he shall be disqualified from applying for or obtaining a licence for other premises in the same county, city, or place.

'That the justices' licence shall state the excise licence which the applicant shall be entitled to obtain from the Inland Revenue Office, according to the acts regulating their issue, the hours during which the house may be kept open, and if on Sundays, Good Fridays, and Christmas Day, and that in the penal portion of licences, as at present used (9 Geo. IV., c. 61, schedule C), there be added, after any words "or" any gaming whatever therein, betting, raffling, or being agent for any prize fight or race.

'That three convictions within two years for any offence against the licensing acts, or for any misdemeanour, shall disqualify from grant of, or renewal of licence.

'That for disqualification the conviction need not be for the same kind of offence

'That the landlord of licensed premises shall be entitled to decline to serve any person whom he may consider to be the worse for liquor, who is disorderly or quarrelsome, or uses any obscene, disgusting, or profane language, and may call in the aid of the police to remove such persons from the premises.'

These suggestions contain some very practical improvements. Like all the proposals we have been considering, they start with the idea of uniformity, the advantage of which all are agreed upon; they adopt from the Liverpool scheme the idea of increasing the value of houses to be licensed for the sale of beer to double that now required, but they do not on that account require the magistrates to give up their discretion as to the requirements of the neighbourhood. They make the magistrates the only licensing authority, but do not abolish all distinctions between licences, enabling the bench to issue licences for the sale of beer only. They propose a veto, local only, it is true, and applying only to new licences, but they extend the radius in such a way as to make its operation more likely to be effective. Acknowledging the evils of the present appeal to quarter sessions being open only to the applicant for a licence, they propose to extend the right of appeal to persons objecting, and repeal the disqualification (9 Geo. IV., c. 61, s. 27), by which justices who have sat in brewster sessions are prevented from acting at quarter sessions. Licences granted under a measure based upon this report would be for six days only; but, to prevent inconvenience, special licences might be granted when good reason was shown for such a course. These would be very great improvements upon the present unsatisfactory laws, and we sincerely hope that Government will not lose sight of these thoughtful and well-considered practical suggestions; not brought forward, be it remembered, by men whom society regards as prejudiced in favour of some pet scheme, but by those who for long years have devoted thought and practical work to magisterial duty, and to the executive work of reformatory institutions, and to the general amendment of the law.

One more scheme of amendment we would refer to with especial interest. The convocation of the province of Canterbury has had a committee sitting for several months 'to consider and report on the prevalence of intemperance, the evils which result therefrom, and the remedies which may be applied.' This committee consisted of men whose names will command the respect of all classes of society, as will be seen from the following list of its members:—The Deans of Canterbury, Chichester, Lichfield, Westminster; the Archdeacons of Coventry, Ely, Exeter, Leicester, Nottingham, Salop; Canons

Argles, Carus, Gillett, Harvey, Oxenden, Wood, Dr. Fraser; Prebendaries Gibbs, Kemp. Archdeacon of Coventry chairman. It is not within the range of this article to discuss the many important facts elicited by the inquiries of this committee, nor to mention the interesting reflections to which its conclusions give rise. We are only concerned with that portion of the report which affects the amendment of the licensing system, and there we find the following proposals:—

‘1. The repeal of the Beer Act of 1830, and the total suppression of beerhouses throughout the country.

‘2. The closing of public houses on the Lord’s Day, except for the accommodation of *bonâ fide* travellers.

‘3. The earlier closing of public-houses on week-day evenings, in accordance with the practice, now or the increase, of early closing in all other businesses. More especially is this necessary on Saturday, when, it is well known, intemperance chiefly prevails.

‘4. A great reduction in the number of public-houses throughout the kingdom, it being in evidence that the number already licensed far exceeds any real demand, and that in proportion as facilities for drinking are reduced, intemperance, with its manifold evils, is restrained.

‘5. Placing the whole licensing system under one authority, and administering it on some uniform plan which would have for its object the abatement of existing temptations to tippling and intemperate habits.

‘6. The rigid enforcement of the penalties now attached to drunkenness, both on the actual offenders, and on licensed persons who allow drunkenness to occur on their premises.

‘7. Passing an act to prevent the same person holding a music, dancing, or billiard licence, in conjunction with a licence for the sale of intoxicating drinks.

‘8. Prohibiting the use of public-houses as committee rooms at elections, and closing such houses on the days of nomination and election in every parliamentary borough.

‘9. The appointment of a distinct class of police for the inspection of public-houses, and frequent visitation of public-houses for the detection of adulterations, to be followed, on conviction, by severe penalties.’

Many of these suggestions have been brought forward in some of the schemes we have already reviewed; others we have not seen incorporated in any of them, although they have been discussed time after time, some in the House of Commons and others elsewhere. It is not so much the novelty of the reforms advocated as their source which renders them so important. When this report shall have been widely circulated, and the evidence on which it is based shall have been before the public, which will have had its attention directed to it by a debate in Convocation, we have no doubt but that its influence will be of the most telling nature. All persons interested in the social regeneration of our country owe an unspeakable debt of gratitude to the Archdeacon of Coventry, not only for the manliness with which he introduced so practical a question into an assembly not generally known as loving subjects so unexciting as the removal of intemperance, but still more for the indefatigable perseverance he has shown in pursuing the

investigations, and the skill only equalled by the energy he has manifested in bringing the inquiries of the committee to a successful issue. We trust he may be equally strengthened by the Holy Spirit in carrying the adoption of the report by convocation as he has been in the preparatory stages.

Although we have spent considerable time in discussing schemes of licensing amendment, we have not exhausted the list which lies before us as we write, and if we refrain from enumerating further plans, it is because in their main features they have been adopted in one or other of the schemes already named. We cannot, however, close our remarks upon this important subject without referring to one branch of it, which we deem most important. All the schemes that we have noticed proceed more or less upon the supposition that licensed houses for the sale of intoxicating drinks are needful, and most of them try by all possible means to limit the number of such houses, and their hours of opening, while placing the power to license in the hands of only one authority. But there are very many persons who regard the public-house licensed by any one to sell drink of any kind, at any hours or under any circumstances, as productive of evil to the general well-being of society. Proceeding on the theory that in proportion to the facilities for obtaining drink will be the amount of drunkenness, they are unable to hope for sobriety so long as any places are open for the sale of intoxicating beverages, and they are therefore advocates of total prohibition. Experience having taught us that laws which are not supported by public opinion are generally ineffective, the supporters of the suppression of the liquor traffic in the kingdom do not urge upon the Legislature to pass a measure like the Maine law, which should by imperial enactment stop the sale of drink, but have concentrated their efforts upon the agitation for what is generally known as 'The Permissive Prohibitory Bill,' which if passed into a law (and it is now before the House of Commons awaiting a second reading) would enable the inhabitants of any district to prohibit the sale within the limits of that district, whenever a majority of two-thirds should so determine. We do not mention this measure as an amendment of the licensing system, or as an alternative to be adopted instead of any of the schemes we have already been discussing. If any of them were adopted, it would still be applicable, for it does not in any way provide for licensing the sale; on the contrary, it only provides for its suppression. If the Legislature should think fit to give all power into the hands of the magistrates, as the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science proposes, or

should only give them such a limited power as the Liverpool bill and the measures of Mr. Selwyn-Ibbetson suggest, or should adopt Mr. Bright's scheme of making town councils the licensing authority; or if (as has been proposed) a special board should be elected for the purpose, the Permissive Bill would be a valuable addition to such a changed condition of things. At present the inhabitants of any place may appear in the licensing court with memorials against the granting of certificates, but they are only allowed to do so by the courtesy of the bench, and although they in reality are the very persons whose interests are most concerned in the proceedings of the day, their memorials may be ignored by the magistrates, and they have no appeal. Under the operation of the Permissive Bill their voice would become potent so soon as a preponderating majority were in favour of prohibition, but not before. The experience of the United States of America teaches that the Maine law is always effective for good whenever it is supported by public opinion; and so the Permissive Bill would never fail of good, because it would never be enforced except under favourable circumstances. The sound of prohibition, no doubt, has a very startling effect upon English ears, and a very natural prejudice against it exists among us; yet, wherever in the United Kingdom the experiment has been made, it has always proved itself a great success. In Scotland, which has not the most exalted reputation for sobriety, the General Assembly of the Church had a committee in the year 1848 to inquire into the state of intemperance. Their report was adopted and approved by the Assembly in the year 1849. The committee had nearly forty reports from parishes that had no places within their bounds for the sale of liquor, and in these cases the people of the parishes were declared free from intemperance. But not only are they free from intemperance; we find in the account given of them remarks like the following: 'The parish pays £3 yearly for the Jedburgh Union Poor-house, but they have not a pauper in it.' 'Crime by the population unknown.' In a parish with 957 inhabitants, 'the poor-rate is 5d.; crime is unknown.' In the case of Dolphinton, in Lanarkshire, 'there is only one pauper on the roll and no assessment for the poor.' Such are the natural results of prohibition. In Ireland there is a district in the county of Tyrone of  $65\frac{1}{2}$  square miles, in which no public-house exists; here, too, poor rates have been diminished and a police station has been removed, as being no longer needed. No doubt there are many other parishes in Ireland which can show the same happy results. In England we can find more examples of prohibition than most

people would expect. Passing over the well-known instances of Saltaire, and the village and neighbourhood of Cambo, in Northumberland, we find that in the report of the committee of Convocation, referred to before in this article, there is this pleasing paragraph :—

'Few, it may be believed, are cognisant of the fact,—which has been elicited by the present inquiry,—that there are at this time within the province of Canterbury upwards of one thousand parishes in which there is neither public-house nor beer-shop; and where, in consequence of the absence of these inducements to crime and pauperism, according to the evidence before the committee, the intelligence, morality, and comfort of the people are such as the friends of temperance would have anticipated.'

Surely these facts should prevent any one from declaring prohibition to be impracticable amongst us. The Permissive Bill is now and then attacked in the most paradoxical manner. It is objected to because it is such a sweeping measure, and in the same breath we are told it would not prohibit the sale of beer outside the district which chose to enforce it, and dismal pictures are drawn of people taking journeys to obtain the means of indulgence. Surely we may rely upon the practical good sense of our countrymen so far, that if they see a neighbouring parish enjoying a happy immunity from poor rates, and from criminal excesses of every kind, they will soon adopt the simple remedy which has had such beneficent results, and prohibition will be extended over a gradually widening area. This gradual extension would meet the objections which are often raised as to the injury which a prohibitory enactment would inflict upon the revenue, and the wrong it would do to the vested interests of those engaged in the liquor traffic. Only by very small steps would the diminution of the income which the State derives from the sale of drink advance, and while this source of taxation was lessened, the increased prosperity caused by a diminution of local taxation, and the liberation of capital for productive industry would soon reimburse the treasury. Those engaged in the traffic would have plenty of time given to them to draw out from their trade and to seek for more useful employment of their capital. Prosperity would advance *pari passu* with prohibition; we should soon find our manufacturing industry barely sufficient to supply the requirements that would be made upon it. Unburthened of the crushing weight of pauperism and crime which, hanging heavily upon us, impedes our progress, we should make such advances as would cast into the shade even the development of the last fifty years, and on a foundation of morality we should build up a structure of national prosperity

unrivalled in the long history of mankind. No scheme of licensing amendment can prove ultimately satisfactory unless it is accompanied by this simple plan of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Permissive Prohibitory Bill:

#### STATISTICAL DATA FOR SOCIAL REFORMERS.

##### I. GROWTH OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC SINCE 1830.

In 1823 a General Licensing Act was passed with the hope on the part of its promoters that it would form a new and life-long settlement of all the questions connected with the licensing system. That hope was quickly and grievously dissipated. Two years more saw the introduction and passing of the Beer Bill, which upset the traditional licensing routine of three centuries, so far as the sale of malt liquors was concerned. Henceforward any person might become a beerseller without the consent of the district magisterial bench. The predicted results were a purer article, greater sobriety, and a death-blow dealt at the brewers' monopoly: the actual results were even greater adulteration, wider intemperance, and the aggrandisement of the brewing interest beyond all precedent or imagination. What the effect has been in the development of the liquor traffic in England and Wales, is a subject worthy of attention. Within three months of the passing of the Beer Bill, 24,342 licences were taken out. In 1831 the number increased to 31,937; in 1832 it sank to 30,917; in 1833 it rose to 33,451; and in the year ending September 30th, 1867 (the last return), it stood at 49,725, having increased to that point from 47,670 in 1866. Before the Beer Bill became law its passing was violently deprecated by the licensed victuallers, who feared that it would ruin them by taking from them that margin of their profits which enabled them to keep open, but they miscalculated the effects of competition in alcoholic drinks; for the spirit licences, which in 1828 were 48,435, became 48,904 in 1830; in 1831 they were 49,749; in 1832 they were 50,225; and in 1833 they had reached 50,828. The licensed victuallers in 1831 are given at 50,547; in 1832 at 50,796; and in 1833 at 52,611; the difference

between these figures and those as to spirit licences, probably having regard to licensed victuallers who confined themselves to the sale of beer under a magistrates' certificate; but taking either the spirit licences or licensed victuallers, the only conclusion possible is, that the beerhouse did not supersede the spirit-shop, but that so far as its influence was felt by the licensed victualling interest, it was of a stimulating and fostering character. The census was taken in 1831, and the population of England and Wales found to be 13,896,797; and as the number of beer licences had increased from 50,903 in 1829 to 83,332 in 1831, it is clear that while in 1829 there was one beer licence to 270 persons, in 1831 there was one beer licence to 167 persons. Coming now down to 1867, we find that in the year ending September 30th, the licensed victuallers were returned at 68,395, and the beersellers at 49,725, a total of 118,120, showing an increase of 16,248 licensed victuallers since 1831, and of 17,788 beersellers, a total increase of 34,036 liquor sellers of these two classes. The population of England and Wales in 1861 was 20,066,224, which may be reckoned at 21,500,000 in 1867. This gives one publican to 314 persons, and 180 persons to every beer licence, including all such licences held by publicans or beersellers. The natural inference from these premises would be that in proportion to population the liquor retailers had diminished since 1831. This inference, though arithmetically correct, if confined to publicans and beersellers, would be egregiously delusive if taken as evidence that the influence of the drink trade is less marked now than in 1831, taking population into account; for there are upwards of 2,000 refreshment houses where wine is sold by retail for consumption on the premises, and thousands of wholesale and retail sellers in wine

and spirits for consumption off the premises. The Wine Licences Bill of Mr. Gladstone in 1860 gave stimulus to the trade in vinous compounds, which, but for the spread and counteractive operation of temperance principles, would have been as fatal to public sobriety as the Beer Act of 1830. It must always be remembered, likewise, in instituting a comparison between the liquor traffic at one period and another, that a gross omission will be made if regard is not had to the comparative size and splendour of the places where intoxicating liquors are sold; and if this very important element is incorporated into the present consideration, the moral balance will have to be struck against the drinking-houses of to-day. Beershops may not have much altered in appearance, but gin palaces, public-houses in general, and music and dancing saloons, all testify but too plainly that the *descensus Averni* has been made brighter and broader with the increase of national wealth and the development of business enterprise in all the departments of national commerce and exchange. The temptation-power and seductiveness of public drinking customs have thus been mightily and wonderfully augmented, to such a degree as more than makes up for any proportionate diminution in the number of licences to sell intoxicating drinks.

## II. CONSUMPTION AND COST OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR IN THE UNITED KINGDOM IN 1868.

The accounts of trade and navigation, which issue monthly from the Board of Trade, usually appear about a month after the date to which they refer. This delay has been much complained of, and the complaints will be louder than ever, as the returns for the month of last December, and for the twelve months ending December, 1868, were not published till the 1st of March. Mr. Bright will be asked to look into this acknowledged abuse of the public patience, previous examples of which have been defended on the score of necessary precautions against errors of entry affecting the reported commerce of the year. We can only attempt to summarise those particulars which relate to the manufacture, importation, and consumption of alcoholic liquors in 1868. Taking, first of all, the article of ardent spirits, the following table

will show the facts concerning the spirits manufactured in the United Kingdom:—

USED AS BEVERAGE ONLY.	Gals.
England .....	11,327,223
Scotland .....	4,907,701
Ireland .....	4,773,710
United Kingdom .....	<u>21,008,634</u>

The gross quantity used in 1867 was 21,199,376 gallons, and in 1866 it was 22,217,390. Between 1867 and 1868 the difference is slight, and comparing the three entries it appears that in England the consumption in 1868 exceeded that of 1867 by 3,570 gallons, Scotland showing a decrease of 75,308, and Ireland of 118,944 gallons, being a nett decrease of 190,742 gallons in the United Kingdom. The quantity of spirits charged with duty in 1868 was 22,043,014 gallons, but of this 703,565 gallons were warehoused on drawback for exportation, &c., and 332,815 were methylated spirits, leaving, as before stated, 21,008,634 for consumption within the United Kingdom.

The ardent spirits imported for use in 1868 were—rum, 3,950,636 gallons; brandy, 3,320,573 gallons; and (not enumerated but computing by the duty) 1,133,310 gallons of Geneva and other sorts; a total of 8,404,519 gallons: a less quantity than in 1867, and about the same as in 1866.

Adding together the British and imported spirits, the aggregate for 1868 was 29,413,153 gallons. On the British spirits the Government duty was £10,504,317, and on the imported spirits £4,333,371, a total of £14,837,688. The cost to the consumers, the people of the United Kingdom, may be calculated on a basis of 20s. per gallon for home spirits, and 22s. per gallon for imported spirits; this estimate covering the cost of production, duty, and manufacturers' and retailers' profits, and the result will then be—

Cost of British spirits .....	£21,008,634
Cost of imported spirits ...	9,244,971
	<u>£30,253,605</u>

With regard to malt, the quantities retained for consumption in 1868 as beer were, in England, 43,163,971 bushels; in Scotland, 2,167,189 bushels; in Ireland, 2,787,873 bushels; a total

of 48,119,033 bushels. In 1867 the corresponding total was 46,310,357 bushels, and in 1866 it was 50,217,828 bushels. Besides the quantity charged duty for beer, there were made in 1868, free of duty, for distillation, 4,549,813 bushels of malt, 243 bushels for feeding cattle, and 1,668,737 bushels for exportation as beer and in drawback—an aggregate manufacture of malt to the extent of 54,337,826 bushels. Looking now at the quantity used for beer-making, and calculating that two bushels of malt produced one barrel of beer (the Excise estimate), we have a manufacture of 24,059,516 barrels of beer from malt: and to this must be added the beer produced from 351,742 cwt. of sugar, *i.e.*, 844,180, a great total of 24,903,696 barrels, which, retailed at 48s. per barrel (allowing for retailers' multiplication of 36 gallons into 48 by dilution), cost the purchasers £59,768,870.

The quantity of wine entered for consumption in 1868 was 15,151,741 gallons, compared with 13,752,428 in 1867, and 13,326,929 in 1866. The customs' duties were £1,521,199; and estimating the average retailers' price to have been 15s. a gallon, the purchasers' outlay on this amount of wine was £11,363,805.

Now, causing these various lines of figures to converge, we have, as the outcome of these inquiries, the following summarised facts presented to us:—

Consumed in 1868—	
Of ardent spirits,	Sold for
29,413,153 gallons,	£30,253,605
Of beer and ale,	
24,903,696 barrels,	59,768,870
Of wine,	
15,151,761 gallons,	11,363,805

An aggregate expenditure	
of.....	£101,386,280

In this stupendous outlay, nothing is allowed for the sums expended in the purchase of cider, perry, and the numerous sorts of British wines which imitate the names and the worst properties of their foreign kindred. If the accuracy of the figures as above presented is unimpeachable, it remains for the patriot, the moralist, the philanthropist, and the Christian to ponder the question, whether the British people have done right or wrong in expending upwards of a hundred millions sterling in 1868 upon the drinks which issue from the distillery, the brewery, and the wine-vat.

## SELECTIONS.

### SCARLET FEVER AND ITS PREVENTION.

MEMBERS of the profession who may happen to have read a letter by Mr. Bradley, of Marlborough College, which appeared in the *Times* of December 5th, and in which he sets forth the conflicting responsibilities imposed on the master by the case of boys at school convalescent from scarlet fever, cannot have failed to sympathise deeply with that gentleman in the difficulties of his position. On the one hand Mr. Bradley shows, in forcible terms, that a long detention in the sick-house is full of evil, moral and physical, to the boy; on the other he is reminded that to send a scarlet fever convalescent away through the country is not only to inflict an unwarrantable peril on the community,

but to infringe the law. Happily, medical science is in a position to furnish an escape from this very painful dilemma. If, in fact, the patient can be so treated as to cease to be an active source of infection by the time he is able to travel, the difficulty is over. Now, if my own experience can be trusted, nothing is easier. Much more indeed can be done to limit the spread of this malignant fever than the public are at all aware of, or than the common practice of medical men generally would seem to indicate.

There is good reason to believe that not only the eruption on the skin, but everything that is shed by the body of the infected, is heavily laden with the

germs or seeds by which (alone, no doubt) the disease is propagated. The discharges of the throat and nose are, I imagine, especially virulent. It is more than suspected, on grounds on which I need not here insist, that those from the bowel are scarcely less so. As the kidney is known to be affected in a very special, and often in a very severe way, by the poison, this organ probably furnishes another outlet for it. All analogy tends to indicate, indeed, that in this case the renal epithelium, which is cast off so plentifully, performs the same eliminative function as that which is cast off in still greater profusion by the outer surface of the body. As the bulk of all these excreta soon finds its way to the cesspool or sewer, the large part which sewers and cesspools are known to play in the dissemination of the fever, and which, quite lately even, has been so strangely misinterpreted, is easily understood. I could enlarge much on this topic, if I had time to do so. It must suffice for the present to say, once for all, that all that has been shown to hold of typhoid fever in regard to these relations—contamination of drinking-water included—may be applied, with little qualification, to scarlet fever also.

Taking these things as our data, the one thing to aim at, therefore, in seeking to prevent the spread of this fever, is to annihilate the germs proceeding from these various sources on their very issue from the body, and before the patient leaves the sick room. In accordance with this view, I have long been in the habit, in all cases which fall under my own care, of enforcing the following simple precautions.

1. The room is dismantled of all the needless woollen or other draperies which might possibly serve to harbour the poison.

2. A basin, charged with chloride or carbolate of lime or some other convenient disinfectant, is kept constantly on the bed, for the patient to spit into.

3. A large vessel, containing water impregnated with chlorides or with Condyl's fluid, always stands in the room, for the reception of all bed and body linen immediately on its removal from the person of the patient.

4. Pocket-handkerchiefs are proscribed; and small pieces of rag are used instead, for wiping the mouth and

nose. Each piece, after being once used, is immediately burnt.

5. As the hands of nurses of necessity become frequently soiled by the specific excreta, a good supply of towels, and two basins, one containing water with Condyl's fluid or chlorides, and another plain soap and water, are always at hand, for the immediate removal of the taint.

6. All glasses, cups, or other vessels, used by or about the patient, are scrupulously cleaned before being used by others.

7. The discharges from the bowel and kidney are received on their very issue from the body, into vessels charged with disinfectants.

By these measures, the greater part of the germs which are thrown off by the internal surfaces are robbed of their power to propagate the fever. Those which are thrown off by the skin require somewhat different management. If my information do not mislead me, it is in dealing with these that the practice of medical men generally is most defective. There are, no doubt, distinguished exceptions; but, for the most part, either nothing is done, or what is done, is done imperfectly or too late. And yet to destroy from the first, as far as possible, the infectious power of what emanates from the skin, is, for obvious reasons, the most important object of all in the way of prevention.

In the first place, as the skin is at once the most extensive surface of the body, and is, *par excellence*, the seat of what, by a very just figure, is called the *eruption*, the crop of new poison which escapes by the skin probably far exceeds in amount that which escapes by the other surfaces. It is impossible to speak in exact figures here. We cannot count such things as we can count peas, or beans, or grains of wheat. But the case of small-pox furnishes us with a standard which cannot far mislead us. And, as we know that, in a case of confluent small-pox, enough new poison is thrown off actually to inoculate with small-pox myriads of others, so there is every reason to believe that the skin-crop in a severe case of scarlet fever is little, if at all, less prolific.

In the next place, as the process of desquamation, by which this crop is finally cast loose, is a very slow one—lasting, for the most part, over many

weeks—the infection from this source is much more abiding than that from the internal sources. But what renders it still more so is the all-important fact that the poison which is liberated by the skin is liberated in the dried state. It is well known—and, indeed, the circumstance has been taken advantage of in the practice of inoculation by cow-pox and other poisons—that animal poisons, when dried at a gentle heat, retain their powers for quite indefinite periods of time. But to be dried at a gentle heat—a heat, lower, in fact, than that which attended its own generation—is precisely the case of the scarlet-fever poison, as cast off by the skin.

Another danger is created by the minute and impalpable form in which the particles armed with the poison are set free. The skin peels off in part, no doubt, in flakes of palpable size, but in still greater part under the guise of dust, which floats in the air, impalpable, like motes in the sunbeam. Each of these little atoms is, potentially, the scarlet fever. While they adhere to the body, they may be readily disarmed; but, once afloat, they are in great degree beyond our power.

It is to these various circumstances—to the countless profusion of the new seed, if I may so speak, which is generated and sown broadcast by every fresh case—to the length of time during which it hangs about the sick, capable every moment of being transferred, with all its deadly power, to thing or person—to the impalpable minuteness of the organic particles in which this seed is imbedded—and, lastly, to the long retention of their properties, in virtue of being in the dried state—that we must look mainly for the true explanation of the well-known subtleness and tenacity of this particular infection. To the many striking illustrations of the subtlety and tenacity already on record, I could, if there were need, add many of my own, quite as striking, and free from all ambiguity; but it is a waste of time and space to burden the page with what is already conceded, and with what to most men must be sufficiently familiar.

These same circumstances are the source of the peculiar embarrassment and perplexity which, in scarlet fever, hangs over the disposal of the convalescent, and the period, so much debated, and at present confessedly undetermined, at which he may be

safely restored to society. They are the source of the dilemma, for instance, to which Mr. Bradley gives such painful expression in the letter referred to at the outset of this paper, a dilemma with which, in private life, medical men have so often to contend, but which, in public schools, if we may judge from the columns of the *Times*, is continually recurring.

Many readers, I dare say, remember the pathetic appeal to the profession which appeared in that journal some ten or twelve months ago, from the pen of a distracted father, urgent to know within what time, and by the use of what measures, his son, who, being convalescent from scarlet fever, was pining in the dreary seclusion of the sick-house of one of our great public schools, might be let out of captivity, and restored to his family. Several letters in reply—one or two especially bearing the signature of 'A Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians,'—offered some more or less sensible suggestions; but all, if my memory do not mislead me, united in the humiliating confession, that no definite time could be named at which persons who had gone through this infection could safely mix with others.

According to my own experience, these difficulties and perplexities may be entirely averted by the employment of the simplest precautions. To be successful, these precautions must be put in force early, and must be thoroughly carried out. The first thing to aim at is, to prevent the minute particles, which are the carriers of the poison, from taking wing until they can be disinfected *in situ*. This, I find, can be perfectly effected by simply anointing the surface of the body, scalp included, twice a day with olive oil. The oil I use is, generally, slightly impregnated with camphor. As far as the main object is concerned, the addition is, perhaps, unimportant; but it is agreeable to the patient, and probably has some part in the relief, which almost always follows the inunction, from the troublesome itching which is a well-known incident of some stages of the disorder. Current views would, perhaps, indicate carbolic acid as a fitter adjunct; but having found the camphorated oil to answer perfectly, I have thought it the part of wisdom to make no change. I may add that the process, so far from being

trying, is very soothing to the sick; and, if it exert any influence at all on the evolution of the disorder, this influence appears to be beneficial rather than otherwise. The precise period at which it should be begun varies somewhat, no doubt, in different cases. As early as the fourth day of eruption, a white efflorescence may often be observed on the skin of the neck and arms, which marks the first liberation of the new death-giving brood. This efflorescence should be made the signal for the first employment of the oil. From this time, the oiling is continued until the patient is well enough to take a warm bath, in which the whole person—scalp again included—is well scrubbed, disinfecting soap being abundantly used during the process. These baths are repeated every other day until four have been taken, when, as far as the skin is concerned, the disinfection may be regarded as complete. If the health be quite recovered—if, in particular, there be no disease of kidney, and no discharge from throat or nostril—the patient (equipped, of course, in a new or perfectly untainted suit) may generally be restored without risk to his family. A week or ten days additional quarantining is, however, seldom objected to; and is, on the whole, perhaps more prudent.

Many medical men are in the habit of fumigating the sick-room either constantly or several times a day, with chlorine or sulphurous acid, pending the whole course of the fever. There can be no objection to this measure; but I do not myself attach much importance to it. Experience of the largest and most decisive kind has shown that chlorine—and I believe the observation applies equally to the other chemical agent—in the degree of atmospheric impregnation respirable by man, has no appreciable influence in preventing the spread of infectious disorders.

To complete the preventive code, immediately after the illness is over—whether ending in death or recovery—the dresses worn by the nurse (which, where possible, should be of linen, or some smooth thing) are washed or destroyed, and the bed and room that have been occupied by the sick are thoroughly disinfected. With these measures, when well done, the taint is finally extinguished.

The success of this method, in my

own hands, has been very remarkable. For a period of nearly twenty years, during which I have employed it in a very wide field, I have never known the disease spread in a single instance beyond the sick-room, and in very few instances within it. Time after time I have treated this fever in houses, crowded from attic to basement, with children and others, who have, nevertheless, escaped infection.\* The two elements in the method are, separation on the one hand, and disinfection on the other. It is almost needless to add, that neither can be secured in the degree here indicated in the houses of the very poor. There are, unhappily, large masses so utterly destitute of every needful thing, that it would be little short of mockery to speak of such measures as those I have just described in connection with them. But the conditions which are denied to the houses of the needy, should always be at hand in the fever hospital; which—small, if you like, but a model of its kind—would, if modern societies knew what belongs to their safety, never be far to seek in any crowded communities. In these matters, beyond all others, the social organisation should be in its perfection, strictly correlative with that of scientific knowledge. If science can point out practicable conditions by which such great evils may be averted, society is, in the highest degree, not only unwise, but blameworthy, if these conditions are not realised. It is high time, at any rate, that some more concerted action should be taken to abate the ravages of this terrible scourge. Every year scarlet fever slays from twenty to twenty-two thousand persons in England alone. There are few families that have not at one time or another felt its deadly power; and it is now and then the cause of tragedies which, although occurring only in single families,

\* One word should be said for the benefit of those who, having yet escaped infection, are living in an infected neighbourhood. For persons so situated, it is well to know that the frequent flooding of their house-drains with disinfectants is a great safeguard. In Bristol, the need of this is superseded by the action of my friend, Mr. Davies, who very wisely keeps the sewers of all districts infected with epidemic disease in a state of permanent disinfection. But it is not every town that can boast of such a zealous and enlightened health officer. In all places where scarlet fever is prevalent, especial care should be taken to have the drinking water perfectly pure.

are of such agonising bitterness as to move the heart of the nation. If the measures here suggested were systematically and energetically put in force against this great enemy of man, the annual number of the slain would soon fall from twenty thousand to a low figure.

P.S.—I need scarcely say that the principles laid down in the preceding paper are equally applicable, as I have elsewhere abundantly shown, to all contagious fevers. I have for many years

applied with great success the method here recommended for scarlet fever, with the modification in detail required by each particular case, to the prevention of small-pox, measles, typhus, &c. In typhus the area and activity of infection may be greatly limited by disinfecting all internal discharges, and by oiling and disinfecting the skin in the same manner as in scarlet fever.—*W. Budd, M.D., Honorary and Consulting Physician to the Bristol Royal Infirmary.*

#### THE SANITARY MISSION WOMAN.

The Sanitary Mission Woman is a recently appointed officer of the Manchester Ladies' Sanitary Association Society, whose duty it has been to visit the houses of the poor, chiefly in the courts and alleys off Deansgate, and in the Collyhurst district. Everywhere the visits of the mission woman have been well received, and she has been continually requested to come again, with an eagerness which proves the sympathy and kindness with which she has entered upon her work. Whitewash pails and brushes are placed at her disposal to lend about in the houses where such cleansing is required, and also chloride of lime for the purification of the air in the rooms of those who are suffering from fever. She has not only given instruction in common sanitary rules to those whom she has found ignorant of or neglecting them, but she will herself wash and make comfortable a sick person whom she may find neglected and dirty, thus encouraging those who are around to follow her example, by showing them how they may do what is useful in the best way.

The following extracts from the diary of the mission woman will still further illustrate the nature of her work:—‘No. 19, C. Road: Much need of sanitary work here. The windows cannot be opened, which prevents sufficient ventilation.—Mrs. M., 21, C. Road: Fever in the house here.—No. 33: Two rooms only in this house, seven persons occupy it. Visited other portions of this road and found fever very frequent, the houses not sufficiently ventilated, and the river, too, aids in causing bad smells.—Mrs. M., 20, S. Street: A very

dirty house.—Mrs. S., 21, I. Street: Found all the family in bed. I roused them up, and found the house in fearful disorder.—Mrs. M., 16, S. Street: Found the children very dirty. Remained until they had a good wash. Expressed a wish that more care might be given to cleanliness every way.—Mrs. W., 26, J. Place: A large family lost in dirt and rags. Remained until the children were washed.—Mrs. W., 1, S. Road: Found a family here requiring attention and kind words.—Mrs. F., 103, C. Road: Daughter very ill indeed. Spent a long time reading and conversing.—Visited J. Place, and again impressed upon each the importance of practising sobriety, and observing order and cleanliness in their persons and homes.—Proceeded to J. Place, and had a conversation with each female on domestic duties.—S., 21, I. Street: A small house occupied by two families, one consisting of nine persons. Very recently five persons in this house had fever. The house is abominably filthy; notwithstanding all I have said, and all they have suffered, no effort is made to improve it. I left chloride of lime.—Mrs. F., 103, C. Road: Remained here some time. One of the daughters was dying, and the mother requested I would not go till all was over.—Mrs. J., F. Street: Remained here till all the children were washed, and saw other things done. Called again and had a conversation with the children, who have a sick mother, quite unable to attend to her domestic duties, and too poor to have anyone in the house to look after the family.—M., 30, S. Street: This family of motherless

children occupy much of my time; and I am pleased to say my labours are not quite in vain.—Mrs. S., 10, S. Street: The mother goes out to work; the children are left to take care of themselves; the consequence is, two of the children have received injuries which will render them cripples during their lives.—Mrs. M., 21, S. Street: This woman is making an effort to discharge her duties as a mother, and seems much encouraged by my visits.—Mrs. G., C. Road: This poor, wretched woman is 80 years of age; has an income sufficient to keep her in comfort, and yet she is so degraded with intemperance that all who know her are afraid to approach her. She appears a walking mass of dirt. I despair of being able to do much if any good at her advanced years. The more I see of the people amongst whom I labour, the more I am convinced that so long as the opportunity to obtain drink exists, every effort to raise them to a better life will be always fruitless.—Mrs. W., 13, B. Street: I am glad to state this family improve in their habits every time I call. When my visits commenced they were almost lost in dirt. Now I find the children are washed daily, and the house kept much cleaner.—S., 16, S. Street: Three children at home, motherless. I give the eldest girl instruction in domestic duties, and find she does all in her power to profit by the instruction given.—Mrs. L., 19, C. Road: A conversation; and left the brush, and money for lime. Called again to ascertain if whitewashing had begun, as it is much needed. The husband had mixed the lime, and commenced operations on

the coal place. I explained to him the bedrooms ought to be cleaned first, and afterwards the places below. Have been kindly received everywhere.—Mrs. F., 103, — Road: Left chloride of lime, with directions for its use.—Mrs. K., 105, — Road: Left as above.—M., 30, J. Place: A very dirty house; unfit for a residence. I requested the woman would clean at once.—Mrs. J., 1, F. Street: Spent a long time here. The mother very ill indeed, and no one to take care of her but one of the children.—W., 1, S. Road: Very dirty. A large family, and no mother.—W., 2, S. Street: This house very dirty.—Mrs. S., 21, J. Street: No improvement in the house.—Mrs. G., 3, H. Street: Very poor; but the house exceedingly clean and neat. Have called to-day upon several families in S. Street who have recently come. Was most kindly received, and requested to repeat my visit.—W., 1, S. Road: These poor children are without a mother, and I regret to say that they, as well as the house, are in a most deplorable condition.'

The above extracts convey some faint idea of the work in which the sanitary mission woman is now engaged; and the committee desire, in conclusion, to commend this Association afresh to the sympathy of the benevolent. Should a generous public confide larger means to their care, they will thankfully send out another sanitary mission woman labourer into the field, if, as they trust they may, find another equally fitted for this labour of self-denying love.—*Report of the Ladies' Sanitary Association.*

#### PAROCHIAL MISSION WOMEN.

I WAS struck some time back by an article in the *Times* upon the subject of almsgiving. The article was occasioned by a letter of Miss Stanley, which brought before the public one of her many works of charity, and asked for assistance in laying up a stock of coals at moderate prices, to be retailed to the poor in the season when both the necessity for the supply and the price would be increased. Your commentary suggested that it might be better to instruct the

poor in exercising provident forethought for themselves. Now, I can so confidently speak of the organisation of the above-named Association as promoting very efficiently the prudent education of the poor, that I venture, on an experience of its working for nine years, to ask your powerful aid in making it more generally known.

There is no lack of Christian sympathy in our people. The drowning or explosion of a mine, a dearth of food or

of cotton supply, is sufficient at once to open their hearts and their coffers. Indeed, this sympathy requires direction and regulation far more than any stimulus. Indiscriminate almsgiving might be easily shown to have occasioned more mischief than lavish expenditure, for the first shilling given to a man who prefers begging for it to earning it, is the first step towards his ruin, while expenditure, however foolish on the part of the spender, commonly becomes a source of support to the honest and industrious workman.

Now the whole scheme of the Parochial Mission Women's Association is directed towards elevating the lowest poor by their own energy, or, still better, saving the all but lowest from sinking yet lower. They are taught how they may make the most of all their means, however slender they may be. Cleanliness in house and person, temperance, intelligent nursing in sickness, provident expenditure, are within the reach of all; provident saving within that of many who have but the scantiest resources, or none beyond their labour. Doubtless model lodging-houses, penny banks, provident clubs, are excellent institutions in themselves, but they are only facilities. The desire to use them must be generated by living agency. This agency is supplied by the society whose claims I advocate.

Its plan is very simple. A small number of ladies act as managers. They have the benefit of advice in matters of finance, or in any difficulty, of gentlemen forming a committee of reference. A gentleman desirous of availing himself of the agency applies to the lady managers, and if the funds permit, his request is at once considered. He himself selects a mission woman, and a lady superintendent, from a higher class, for his parish, who must be approved by the managers, and the organisation is then complete. A room must be provided for the purposes after-mentioned.

The mission woman is selected from the class among whom she is to work. Her payment is regulated as far as possible by her previous weekly earnings, and does not much exceed them. Her duty is to visit, under the clergyman's directions, all who will welcome her, and these soon become the large majority. She gives no alms, but offers instruction and affords facilities by

which they may help themselves. She enjoins, and if needs be will show them how, to scrub and clean their rooms, and what to do in case of sickness, and induces them to deposit with her any money they may be able to lay by for the purchase of necessities or comforts. She informs them of, and invites them to attend, weekly meetings held by the lady superintendent, which lady, having received a loan in advance from the general fund, has a supply of blankets, bedding, &c., with Bibles and Prayer-books, which she keeps at the mission-room; and there such women as may be able meet her and the mission woman for a couple of hours. Materials are there examined and selected, and may be worked upon (many have at these meetings first learned to use a needle and thread), while the superintendent reads aloud for a part of the time, and the clergyman usually opens or closes the meeting with Scripture reading and prayer. No article, made or unmade, is allowed to be taken from the room until the whole of the cost price has been paid.

Now the advantages of this scheme are:—

1. The parish is a definite area to be worked, and instead of broad-cast, haphazard schemes of benevolence, an aim is given, and the effect of the work can be and is watched. Returns are required weekly by the managers from the lady superintendents of the number of visits made by the mission woman, the amount of money received, and other work done. Each manager receives these returns from specified districts, and visits the meetings without giving any previous notice. If the mission be not satisfactorily worked, it is either abandoned or suspended. A mission may be closed for any cause by the managers, on the one hand, or the clergyman, on the other, at a month's notice.

2. The mission woman and lady superintendent have their definite civilising lay work, and the clergyman is assisted by their co-operation, not thwarted by controversial zeal.

3. The mission women are of the same class as those they instruct. A clergyman or lady superintendent might make many visits without producing the effect desired. They and the poor do not often understand each other when it comes to be a question of inter-

ference with domestic habits and arrangements.

4. The test of this effective teaching is furnished by the returns. In the year 1867 over £7,000 (a portion of it in farthings) was collected from the poor of 130 mission districts. The society commenced its work with six missions, and the deposits in the first year amounted to £85. A steady increase to the numbers of 1867 is a very noteworthy fact.

The testimony to the value of the institution is uniform from the clergy who have experienced its effects. The Archbishop of Canterbury while Bishop of London gave it his warmest sanction, and from the fund which bears his name annual grants are made towards its support. No distinction is made with reference to any supposed theological views of incumbents who wish for the assistance of a mission woman. The average cost of each mission is £35 a year. The clergyman is expected to guarantee a certain portion of this sum, according to the circumstances of the case. The only items of expenditure are the woman's salary and occasionally the rent of a central room, the advance loans being repaid as the capital of each district increases. The total cost of management in 1867 was only £180. This cost is mainly incurred by the employment of one clerk and the hire of an office, at 15, Cockspur-street. Scarcely a charity can be named where so much is achieved by so small an expenditure.

Those who know with what despair many a clergyman or district visitor enters a sick room, the window of which is closed, the floor of which is foul with dirt, while the patient possesses neither bed, bedstead, chair, nor table, perhaps no blanket or coverlid, can alone appreciate the transformation that can be effected by a woman in the same class of life as the sufferer, who teaches cleanliness, order, industry, and foresight, through the medium of Christian kindness and Christian example.

The Rev. T. J. Rowell, the well-known incumbent of St. Margaret's, Lombury, thus speaks of what he himself witnessed of the working of the agency in question:—

'For 25 years I have been actively engaged in duties in the East of London. I have learnt to feel the want of this agency, and I have now witnessed its usefulness. It is wonderfully adapted to meet the most urgent wants of the poor. . . . There is no room in the lowest part of the poorest house into which the mission women do not readily find their way. Every clergyman I talked with, of whatever shade of theological opinion he might be, was emphatic about the good done by them.'

There are at this time urgent applications pending from parishes in the poorest parts of London and Southwark, none of which can be accepted unless further aid be given to the general fund.—*Lord Hatherley, in the Times.*

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

*Our Unemployed: An Attempt to Point Out some of the Best Means of Providing Occupation for Distressed Labourers; with Suggestions on a National System of Labour Registration; and Other Matters Affecting the Well-being of the Poor.* By Alsager Hay Hill, LL.B., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, and an Ex-Almoner of the Society for the Relief of Distress in Eastern London. Pp. 49. London: W. Ridgway, 159, Piccadilly; and at the Office of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, 1, Adam-street, Adelphi, W.C.

This paper was originally written in

response to an offer of a prize by Mr. R. R. Lloyd, of Birmingham, for the best essay on 'A Feasible Plan for the Temporary Employment of Operatives and Workmen in Casual Distress.' Although its author did not win the prize, which went to Mr. Arthur R. Arnold, it was highly commended by the council of the Social Science Association, who were the appointed judges. After further reading and meditation, Mr. Hill amplified his paper, and now publishes it in pamphlet form, as he hopes, for the public benefit. In his summing-up, his proposals are thus recapitulated:—

\* In the first place, then, I recommend

the construction of some machinery by which the thorough classification and recognition of the various sections of our poorer classes may be established, before attempting to relieve or employ them. And for this purpose, I think that a system of local, district, and, if possible, national registration of labour should be instituted. Such system of registration for the present I propose to be grafted on, as far as possible, to the existing framework of the Post-office service, especially as developed in the Savings Bank and Insurance departments of that office. Side by side with this system of registration for the really industrious but unemployed class, I would recommend a most careful classification on the part of the Poor Law authorities of all persons coming under their operations. By this means the residuum of the industrious unemployed, separated from the stratum of pure pauperism, might be placed under the best conditions for returning as soon as possible to labour and re-assuming their proper position amongst the industrial ranks of the community, whilst the idle and incompetent would be left to the necessarily sterner discipline of an efficient Poor Law, by which the greatest possible labour obtainable from them would be demanded for the least possible wage, consistent with the health of the pauper. Having by these means, therefore, separated the really deserving and unemployed poor from the idle and incompetent, I recommend the distribution and employment of the better class of the former on all public works of utility, created by any existing or future compulsory clauses in Acts of Parliament. The indication and promotion of such works would be at first entrusted to *Local Improvement Committees*, composed as far as possible of representative and public spirited men, acting in the first entrance in a volunteer capacity, but hereafter if possible to be clothed with such official authority as the State may think fit to extend to them. I have further suggested that the execution of these public works with other subsidiary measures, will, if properly encouraged and energetically pursued, afford sufficient occupation for our unemployed poor, until such times as the more permanent and general remedies which the progress of society brings with it, have acquired the strength to supersede such temporary palliatives. Meanwhile,

and as a few subsidiary methods of meeting the acknowledged wants of the unemployed, I have suggested (1st) the construction of casual wards on a uniform plan, and accommodated to the wants of the various districts, throughout the length and breadth of the land, and this suggestion, it is contended, is based on the best principles of economy and national policy, both for the suppression of crime and the maintenance of industry. The national monument to Lord Brougham also finds a place in this part of my scheme, and that liberal public subscriptions for such a purpose would be forthcoming this winter in place of our usual indiscriminate almsgiving to the unemployed there is little reason for doubt. (2nd.) The adoption and development of the dry-earth system of sewerage in town and country, affording as it would employment to thousands, and multiplying the fertilising resources of the country at large. And (3rd) I have recommended the establishment primarily, in the metropolis and elsewhere, if circumstances demand it, of a properly registered staff of crossing-sweepers and district commissioners, the latter class to be recruited as far as possible from the better educated but invalided section of the unemployed poor. I may add the more perfect registration of employment of scavengers under this head. The above are the main recommendations which this paper contains, others of a collateral description might have been added, but will readily suggest themselves to any persons who may be disposed to follow me generally in the propositions I have made. Such recommendations are, I am well aware, but a very slender contribution towards the study of a great and most urgent question. To be of any true service they must be supplemented by the thoughts, sympathies, and willing action of those in whose hands the real reformation of society lies. From a new Parliament and the early energies of young legislators much may be expected in the direction of those improvements which I have now but faintly indicated. National education, protected co-operation amongst working men, and a properly organised system of emigration are among the first boons we may expect at their hands; but it is in the steady development of sober and industrious habits amongst the operative classes themselves, and in the true patriotism

which urges every man to do his best for the common weal that the ultimate triumph must be looked for. The closer union of all classes, the diminution of crime, the repression of drunkenness, and a thousand other lesser victories have to be won before the campaign is accomplished.'

We thought the proposal for a national registration of labour so good that we suggested it ourselves in a former number of *Meliora*. Its engraving on the Post-office service is Mr. Hill's proposition, and deserves consideration. On the whole, we like his recommendation of a careful classification of paupers. He would divide them into three categories,—first, second, and third,—with certificates as in bankruptcy. Misfortune or other unavoidable causes would entitle to a first-class certificate and liberal out-door relief; improvidence, to a second-class paper and a scantier allowance; reserving the third-class certificate for vice and wrong-doing, which is to be relieved in the workhouse and with hard labour.

*Vignettes of American History.* By Mary Howitt. Pp. 138. London: S. W. Partridge and Co., 13, Paternoster Row.

THE American claims, as a matter of course, to be a sharer in the great inheritance of English history and literature. But the Englishman is entitled to set up a counter-claim. The Pilgrim Fathers were Britons, and we, too, are proud of them; we vindicate our right to glory in their renown, and to read, as in the book of our own kindred, the inspiring details of their history. And as these earliest settlers were ours, the land they subdued to themselves is part of our patrimony. Through them we went to it in past centuries; and to, and with their posterity, our own brothers, sons, and cousins continue to go, and to become united, to this day. All that concerns the United States of America has, thus, interest and consequence for us; and animated by this just feeling, Mrs. Howitt has reproduced in her own charming style, a score of striking incidents in American history, for the information of young English folk. Her subjects are these: 'Christopher Columbus'; 'Cortez Approaching Mexico'; 'Pacahontas Interceding for John Smith'; 'Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers'; 'Meeting of the

the Assembly in Virginia'; 'Roger Williams's Departure from Salem'; 'John Eliot Preaching to the Indians'; 'Rhode Island Receives its Charter'; 'The Sheriff Ejected in New Hampshire'; 'Bacon Addressing the Council'; 'William Penn and Pennsylvania'; 'Penn's Treaty with the Indians'; 'William Penn's Departure'; 'Whitfield Preaching'; 'The Death of General Wolfe'; 'Stamp Act Riots'; 'The Boston Tea Party'; 'General Burgoyne and the Indians'; 'Washington's Reception in New York'; and 'Washington Takes Leave of the Army.' To each of these incidents an excellent illustration, done on wood, is added; making of the book a collection at once of 'pictures' and 'tales,' admirably adapted for the proud possession, gratified perusal, and useful instruction of young people.

*The Ordinance of Levites.* By James Suter, Author of *Moral Statistics of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland*. Pp. 96. Edinburgh: William P. Nimmo; London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

UNABLE to accept the premisses, it is not surprising that we disagree with the conclusions of the writer of this queer little book. 'In the earliest times,' he says, 'the fathers and elders, or first-born of mankind, were the priests and rulers, and received tithes as their rightful inheritance.' Allowing it to have been so (a very gratuitous assumption), this was a comfortable arrangement, no doubt, for the fathers and elders; but the case for the sons and juniors is left unstated. 'The fathers and elders at first possessed both tithes and authority, but when younger men obtained authority they withheld the tithes from the elders.' Was it very wicked of them to withhold them? Black mail is not a pleasant thing to be the victim of, under any of its names; and why one should pay it to one's own brother or uncle because he happened to be born first, is a question that does not carry with it its own sufficient explanation. Nor does it seem to follow from the mere fact that the Hebrews, who had neither poor rates nor pew rents to pay, were expected to pay tithes, that every Englishman and Scotchman is bound to do likewise. Neither is it easy to acknowledge that even if he were, the members of the

tribe of Levi still retain their old right to the tithes; and the difficulty is increased when they are said to be entitled not in their own persons, but in the old men and women of every nation. 'Every one of the Levites,' Mr. Suter says, 'male and female, rich and poor, strong and weak, learned and unlearned, had an equal right, irrespective of individual preference or merit, to the tithes of the people. So all the elders or first-born, male and female, rich and poor, strong and weak, learned and unlearned, have now the same rights as the elders and first-born of primeval times.' The logical chasm yawning between the two sentences in the foregoing quotation we are quite unable to overleap. Mr. Suter takes a run and a jump, and shuts his eyes tight, and is across in a moment. We stand on the brink, look down, shake our heads, and give up the enterprise in despair. It is useless to attempt to follow a writer who sets at defiance all the possibilities of the logical mind. His main object appears to be to persuade the public at large that all old people, whether rich or poor, are Levites, and as such are entitled to be pensioned. Success to Mr. Suter.

*Graham's Temperance Guide, Handbook, and Almanack for 1869.* Edited by the Rev. Dawson Burns, A.M. Maidstone: G. H. Graham, 35, Kingsley Road.

By successive steps, Graham's Guide has risen from a moderate to a high degree of excellence and value. It obtained the accession of its present editor in a manner very creditable to its proprietor. The eagle-eye of the Rev. Dawson Burns detected in the Guide, as originally published, a multitude of errors; and it happened that in the columns of the *Alliance News* he had an opportunity of pointing out some of these. Mortified, no doubt, Mr. Graham must have felt, but his retort was masterly. In effect, he said, 'You who find so much fault, show us how much better you can manage the matter.' Mr. Burns accepted the challenge, and the result is an improvement in the quality, and an enlargement in the quantity, of the material of the Guide, setting this high above all contemporary publications of the kind. The list of contents alone fills four closely printed

pages of the Guide, so numerous and varied are they. It might be a much easier labour to name the matters connected with the Temperance movement that are not contained in this volume, than to give a list of those which are. For the absent items, a very small space would suffice; a minutely detailed account of those presented in the Guide would occupy a very considerable amount of room. A single glance of an eye intelligent of temperance matters, must be quite enough to satisfy the owner that this volume is singularly rich in the amount and variety of the information it contains, and is in excellent editorial hands. To all the active part of the temperance public, we hold it to be quite indispensable.

*Jenny's Geranium: or, the Prize Flower of a London Court.* Pp. 95. London: S. W. Partridge and Co., 9, Paternoster Row.

'JENNY'S geranium,' as this pleasing little tale informs us, first bloomed in a good man's garden; thence it went to a dreary, miserable room in a 'court' in London. There it became a joy and gladness past expression to a little orphan girl, who, while mourning the loss of a fond mother, had the additional grief of being the child of a drunken father. Regardless of his daughter's love for the plant, this besotted creature one night took it to the public-house to sell for drink. The geranium was rescued by a friend of Jenny's, and was restored to its owner; and after a succession of events, including the severe illness and reformation of the father, Jenny, the heroine of the tale, is restored with her parent to comfort and well-being. The good supposed to have resulted from the culture of her geranium extends beyond Jenny and her father. The pleasing example spreads. Other geraniums are cultivated in the neighbourhood, and many people become reclaimed from drunkenness. If the reader does not quite see how all this could well come out of a geranium, that matters the less as the tale is nicely told and carries the reader along with it very pleasantly. The wood-cuts in which Jenny appears are really lovely.

*Sermons.* By the Rev. John Ker, Glasgow. Pp. 385. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.

UNABLE to continue his regular pulpit

labours, Mr. Ker seeks an audience by means of the press, 'chiefly for the sake of those whom the author was accustomed to address by the living voice.' 'His purpose will be served if the volume helps them in the way of remembrance, and more than served if, through God's blessing, it shall prove of any use beyond their circle.' 'Most of the sermons,' he adds, 'though not all, have been preached.' 'The subjects have not been selected with any attempt at unity in the illustration of Christian doctrine or duty. An effort has rather been made to secure a variety of topics. When human knowledge and life are spreading out into ever wider circuits, the Christian ministry must seek to show itself a debtor to men of every class and character, and must endeavour to prove that there is no department of thought or action which cannot be touched by that gospel which is the manifold wisdom of God. The more we study the way of God's commandments, the more shall we find it as broad as His other works, and increasingly rich to meet all the developments of human nature. At the same time, it is hoped that the unity sought to be indicated by beginning and ending the volume with Christ Jesus, is not merely formal, and that, whatever may be the theme, it will be seen and felt to base itself in that One Foundation, and to strive, though all imperfectly, after the excellency of His knowledge.'

The volume contains twenty-four sermons, of which the following are the titles:—'Christ and His Words.'—'Christ in Simon's House.'—'The Pharisee's Mistake.'—'God's Word Suited to Man's Sense of Wonder.'—'Increase of Knowledge, Increase of Sorrow.'—'God Declining First Offers of Service.'—'A Worldly Choice and its Consequences.'—'Christ the Day-dawn and the Rain.'—'Is Man entirely Selfish?'—'Not Far from the Kingdom of God.'—'Work and Watching.'—'The Burial of Moses; its Lessons and Suggestions.'—'Moses and Stephen.'—'The Old Testament and the New.'—'Faith's Approach to Christ.'—'Christ Not Pleasing Himself. Christian and Social Tolerance.'—'The Changes of Life and their Comforts in God.'—'The Gospel and the Magnitude of Creation.'—'Reasons why God should Contradict our Hope of Immortality if

it were False.'—'Christ's Delay to Interfere Against Death.'—'Judas and the Priests.'—'The End of Evil Associations.'—'Christ's Reticence in Teaching Truth.'—'Christ's Desire to Eat of the Last Passover.'—'Christ's Prayer for His Disciples.'—'Hope and Patience.'—'The Eternal Future Clear Only in Christ.'—There is much that pleases us in these discourses. They are thoughtful, liberal, and earnest, and are decidedly superior to the average of published sermons.

*Invention of the Electric Telegraph. The Charge against Sir Charles Wheatstone, of Tampering with the Press, as Evidenced by a Letter of the Editor of the 'Quarterly Review,' in 1855.* Reprinted from the 'Scientific Review.' London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

The dispute between Mr. Cooke and Sir Charles Wheatstone as to their respective claims of honour in electric telegraphy is brought to a crisis in this pamphlet. Allegations are made herein which, if allowed to go by default, must not only be taken to prove that Mr. Cooke had by far the principal share in the introduction of the telegraph in England (that is now becoming generally allowed), but also that Sir Charles Wheatstone, his quondam partner, is guilty of serious want—we will not say of magnanimity—but of justice. Mr. Cooke's brother does battle with a zealous truly fraternal. It is remarkable, however, that whilst Cooke and Wheatstone are debating their shares in the practical introduction of electric telegraphy, our friends in the United States always claim for themselves the honour of the invention. We should like to have seen this aspect of the case set in a clear light by the author of this pamphlet.

*Topics for Teachers. A New Work for Ministers, Sunday-school Teachers, and others, on an entirely original plan.* By James Comper Gray, Halifax, author of 'The Class and the Desk.' Illustrated with over 200 engravings and 8 first-class maps.

The second, third, and fourth parts of this new work have been forwarded to us. It is to be completed in eighteen monthly portions. The zoology, botany, and geography of the Bible are lucidly expounded with the aid of woodcuts in the first section, which is devoted to 'Nature.' This seems likely to be a very

useful compendium for Sunday-school teachers.

*The Hive. A Storehouse of Material for Working Sunday-school Teachers.*

Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

This is another of the serials which have started up of late to supply wants well understood and often bitterly felt by Sunday-school teachers. It is very well put together.

*Old Jonathan. The District and Parish Helper.* London: W.H. Collingridge, 117, Aldersgate-street.

*Old Jonathan* has assumed a new shape. No longer a large sheet, it now more nearly resembles the 'British Workman' in shape and size. It belongs to the same useful class of publications.

*The Appendix. A Manual of Chants, Anthems, and Hymns, for Public Worship.* London: J. Snow and Co., 2, Ivy Lane, Paternoster Row.

SIXTY chants and canticles, forty-two anthems, and sixty-five hymns, make up this little collection. It purports to be, not simply an appendix, but the appendix; to what, the compiler forgets to state. The chants and canticles are well selected and intelligently pointed; the anthems have references to music suitable for them; and the hymns are almost all of superior quality, mostly culled from such sources as are familiar to the Episcopalian churchman.

*Illustrated Temperance Anecdotes; or, Facts and Figures for the Platform and the People.* Compiled by the Editor of the 'British Workman.' Pp. 144. London: S. W. Partridge and Co., 9, Paternoster Row.

Most readers of the 'British Workman' must retain, impressed in their minds, recollections of anecdotes often set off with striking engravings, and each teaching some useful lesson of thrift and prudence, of temperance, common sense, or piety; and perhaps the thought has occurred to some, that a handy little volume, nicely printed and bound, and filled with the best of these anecdotes, would be a valuable present to give to some friend struggling with the special perils that haunt working class life. Here, now, is just such a volume. The major part of its contents has already been printed in the 'British Workman'; and as some of the anecdotes are known to have been the means of inducing the aban-

donment of drinking habits, and the right application of wages in clothing and feeding families, and furnishing homes, it is now hoped that in this collective form, the anecdotes will have a new mission of usefulness. Temperance advocates and Sunday-school teachers especially will find the volume useful. Of the one hundred and twenty anecdotes here given, a large number are appropriately illustrated.

*Healing Leaves; Gathered by Walter Ludbrook.*

*London Temperance Tracts.*—The Depôt, Milton Hall, Camden Town.

CAPITAL tracts for temperance reformers, and exceedingly cheap. More than 600,000 of them have been sold already.

*The Life-Boat, or Journal of the National Life-Boat Institution.* Issued Quarterly. London: Richard Lewis, 14, John-street, Adelphi.

INDUSTRIOUSLY fans and helps to keep alive the glorious spark of shipwreck-rescuing humanity.

*The East-London Evangelist: A Monthly Record of Christian Work among the People, and Organ of the East-London Christian Mission.* Edited by William Booth. London: Morgan and Chase, 38, Ludgate Hill.

FULLY recognises the importance of temperance advocacy in aid of evangelising work.

*The Scattered Nation.* Edited by C. Schwartz, D.D. Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, London.

A MONTHLY religious magazine, edited by a Christian Jew.

*The Church.* London: Elliot Stock. A MONTHLY penny magazine.

*The Appeal: A Magazine for the People.* London: Elliot Stock.

A MONTHLY religious magazine, price one halfpenny.

*The Book-Hawking Circular; a Quarterly Paper of the Church of England Book-Hawking Union, forming a Useful Manual for the Promoters, Officers, and Agents of Book-Hawking Associations in England and Wales.* London: Church of England Book-Hawking Union Depôt; and Rivington, 3, Waterloo Place.

*London Temperance Almanac for 1869, and Diary of Temperance Reformers, &c., &c.* London: Walter Ludbrook, Milton Hall, Camden Town.

# Meliora.

---

---

## MR. LECKY'S HISTORY OF EUROPEAN MORALS.

1. *A History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne.* By William Edward Hartpole Lecky, M.A. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1859.
2. *The Fortnightly Review for May.* Art. 2. *Mr. Lecky's First Chapter.* By the Editor.

MR. LECKY possesses in an eminent degree the genius of a moral historian. He has a profound sympathy with every phase of human life, subtle insight, patient research, vast learning, a chaste and manly style, and never allows himself to be warped by a desire to spin fine theories. The great defect of his present work to many minds will be its want of two or three generalisations that can be carried in the memory; but when we remember the essential difference between a work like Buckle's 'History of Civilisation' and a history of morals, the defect, if so it be, does not seem very striking. Mr. Lecky excels in narrative, and spares no labour in making its details as full and exact as possible. His footnotes are rich in curious learning, and his whole work is conceived in a liberal and philosophic spirit. The introductory chapter on 'The Natural History of Morals' is, of course, controversial, and is the weakest portion of the book. It has already evoked a vigorous and smart reply, on behalf of the utilitarian school, from the pen of Mr. John Morley, in the 'Fortnightly Review,' and we are reluctantly compelled to consider it proved that the chapter in question has 'the double demerit of doing the greatest possible injustice to the utilitarian school, and the least possible justice to the intuitive school.' With that admission, however, our fault-finding ends. The chapter is no necessary part of the book, except as it establishes Mr. Lecky's honesty in refusing to write a

history of morals from the intuitive stand-point without stating why he belonged to that school, and it is pretty certain to be considerably modified in a subsequent edition. Whatever haziness there may be about it does not impair the value of what follows; nay, we can conceive an eclectic moralist contending that Mr. Lecky's later chapters are evidence that utility does supply part of a general conscience, even though there may be a fundamental moral sense in individuals. Mr. Lecky's chapters on the Pagan Empire, the Conversion of Rome, and the Position of Women are full of interest, and will cause many readers to regret that he did not undertake to bring his history down to a much later period. The seven hundred years between Augustus and Charlemagne certainly exhibited the moral revolutions effected by Christianity, and almost bring the present work down to a previous one from the same hand; but still there seems a gap left which even copious foot-notes do not enable us to bridge over, and we are left amidst a host of difficulties the work has raised without settling, and of doubts it has created without satisfying. These may be evidences of the author's power and of our own narrowness of vision, since he leaves with a full and restless mind. However that may be, his history will have a powerful interest for all students of morals, and open new fields of inquiry for all who are attracted by the moving agencies in human evolution.

The historian of morals, remarks Mr. Lecky, has three questions to deal with; the changes that have taken place in the general moral standard, in the moral type or ideal of successive periods, and in the realised morals of the people. By the first, he understands the degrees in which, in different ages, recognised virtues have been enjoined and practised; by the second, the relative importance that in different ages has been attached to different virtues; and by the third the distance or unity between moral teachers and the people. His example of the first is a very happy one. He remarks that 'a Roman of the age of Pliny, an Englishman of the age of Henry VIII., and an Englishman of our own day would all agree in regarding humanity as a virtue, and its opposite as a vice; but their judgment of the acts which are compatible with a humane disposition would be widely different. A humane man of the first period might derive enjoyment from those gladiatorial games, which an Englishman, even in the days of the Tudors, would regard as perfectly barbarous; and this last would, in his turn, acquiesce in many sports which would now be emphatically condemned.' Thus, it may be true, as Buckle contends, that we have added little to the

'great dogmas of which moral systems are composed,' whilst our intellectual acquisitions have very signally increased, and yet it does not prove that morals are stationary, for in this one department we have made most rapid advances. Kindness to animals, for example, is a new field of moral conquest, and an amount of cruelty might have been practised a thousand years ago which would now be utterly repugnant to the good sense of the most uneducated. We shall presently trace this more at length, and simply refer to it now in order to emphasize the central truth of Mr. Lecky's book, that moral progress is a fact dependent on many causes, and, when not seen in the acquisition of new truths, is at least visible in the fuller and newer meaning given to old ones. In explaining the meaning of a change in the moral type, Mr. Lecky refers to the order of precedence accorded to different virtues in different civilisations. His use of the term rudimentary, applied to the cardinal test-virtue of any one period, is very unfortunate, and not a little misleading, now we have come almost to restrict the term to its secondary meanings. If our readers will use a convenient synonym they will much better understand what follows.

'Rudimentary virtues vary in different ages, nations, and classes. Thus, in the great republics of antiquity patriotism was rudimentary, for it was so assiduously cultivated that it appeared at once the most obvious and the most essential of duties. Among ourselves much private virtue may co-exist with complete indifference to national interests. In the monastic period, and in a somewhat different form in the age of chivalry, a spirit of reverential obedience was rudimentary, and the basis of all moral progress; but we may now frequently find a good man without it, his moral energies having been cultivated in other directions. Common truthfulness and honesty are rudimentary virtues in industrial societies, but not in others. Chastity, in England at least, is a rudimentary female virtue, but scarcely a rudimentary virtue amongst men, and it has not been in all ages, and is not now in all countries, rudimentary amongst women. There is no more important task devolving upon a moral historian than to discover in each period the rudimentary virtue, for it regulates in a great degree the position assigned to all others.'

The moral type of a period thus leads to the formation of groups or orders of virtues, ranged in subordination or equality to the 'rudimentary' one, or in other words:—

'The heroic, the amiable, the intellectual virtues form in this manner distinct groups; and in some cases the development of one group is incompatible, not indeed with the existence, but with the prominence of the others. Content cannot be the leading virtue in a society animated by an intense industrial spirit, or submission or tolerance of injuries in a society formed upon a military type, or intellectual virtues in a society where a believing spirit is made the essential of goodness, yet each of these conditions is the special sphere of some particular class of virtues. The distinctive beauty of a moral type depends not so much on the elements of which it is composed as on the proportions in which those elements are combined. The characters of Socrates, of Cato, of Bayard, of Fénelon, and of St. Francis Assisi are all beautiful, but they differ generically, and not simply in degrees of excellence. To endeavour to impart to Cato the

distinctive charm of St. Francis, or to St. Francis that of Cato, would be as absurd as to endeavour to unite in a single statue the beauties of the Apollo and the Laocoön, or in a single landscape the beauties of the twilight and of the meridian sun. Take away pride from the ancient Stoic and the modern Englishman, and you would have destroyed the basis of many of his noblest virtues, but humility was the very principle and root of the moral qualities of the ascetic.'

This humility, we may also note, was a moral advance, because it added a new type to the Western world, and when, in its celibate form, it had united itself with militarism, flowered into chivalry and found a broader ideal in Charlemagne. Mr. Lecky fails to note here, strangely, seeing that the fact is so obvious, that the more complex our civilisation becomes the less and less any one typical virtue holds sway. Thus, modern nations have several prevailing types. We are not less patriotic than military nations, when fully aroused, but we are moved by so many impulses that the motive to arouse us must be stronger. Nor are we less reverential, though it is in a different fashion, or less charitable, though in a form that has varied with the extinction of European slavery and an organised system of State relief of the poor. Stoicism taught the brotherhood of man, and Christianity effectually destroyed the patriotism of the old type; but we should mistake if we supposed nations are less patriotic, when occasion demands, because constant intercourse with other nations softens racial and religious animosities, and commerce has developed a new basis and bond of union.

Patriotism still forms one of the group of virtues that constitute character, and whether it shall be a temporary test-virtue depends upon considerations which are not constant, as in past times, but vary as the winds. If any one doubts the patriotism of industrial England, let him raise the cry of invasion, and England will cheerfully bear extra income tax, spend millions in fortifications, and raise an army of citizen soldiers, who would die to a man in defence of their native land. If this is not patriotism, we hardly know what is. Other virtues might be treated in the same way. A simple type disappears with a simple civilisation, and the golden possibilities of humanity increase with every moral and intellectual acquisition. This, in truth, is the very opposite of moral change without progress. A man may be distinguished for humility, and yet fight as terribly as Cromwell's Roundheads did; he may be full of religion, without denouncing the iniquity of doubt; and he may be animated by the restlessness of industrial civilisation, without participating in what Mr. Lecky conceives to be its characteristic unchastity. 'We may gain more than we lose, but we

always lose something,' Mr. Lecky observes. Some virtues, he thinks, die out with advancing civilisation. His language is hardly precise enough, however, to convey what we believe to be the truth, as just expressed. The simple strength and possible range of a virtue may be lessened, but it has entered into the moral fibre of a civilised nation, and will be quite as intense, though limited in its sphere of action, and much less frequently called into activity. What we have lost is a grand simplicity; what we have gained is a grand capacity. Rome received men as slaves, 'and sent them back Romans,' said Montesquieu, referring to the later days of the Roman Empire. We might almost say the like of a Christian civilisation; it came to men as the bondsmen of single and rude virtues—it has made them not only patriots, but brothers, priests, and kings, 'by the right of an earlier inheritance and the imposition of a mightier hand.'

As it is impossible for us to exhaust the topics Mr. Lecky treats in the space at our command, and it would be unwise to touch upon many points involving controversy, theological and scientific, we purpose to take three distinct subjects as proving the advance of morals not only within the period to which he restricts himself, but beyond it. These are, suicide, slave-holding, and humanity to animals.

The first subject has this special interest about it—it brings us in direct opposition to that repulsive doctrine respecting suicide which Buckle has done his best to popularise. 'Suicide,' he writes, 'is merely the product of the general condition of society. . . . In a given state of society a certain number of individuals must put an end to their own life. This is the general law; and the special question as to who shall commit the crime depends, of course, upon special laws, which, however, in their total action, must obey the large social law to which they are all subordinate. And the power of the larger law is so irresistible that neither the love of life nor the fear of another world can avail anything towards checking its operation.' A very little examination of the question, by Mr. Lecky's help, will serve to render this matter much clearer, and empty the vague phrase 'general condition of society' of its strange pomposity. If suicide is due to a general law, we might naturally expect it to vary in amount with the cheerful or sombre cast of mind prevailing in any age or nation. Restlessness, panics, and gloom ought surely to be general conditions favourable to its development, and, if no other causes were at work, ought invariably to lead to epidemics of it; whilst a joyous, calm, and easy life should do the very

reverse. Historically we do not find this to be the case. The classic period of history shows us that suicide is largely dependent upon moral ideas respecting death and a future life, and we also find suicide much more common then than in modern times. What general causes were more favourable to it then than now? We are completely at a loss to answer. In Greece the common notion was that it was quite allowable to kill one's self, as we gather from Plato's 'Phaedo' and other sources. Valerianus Maximus even states that poison was kept by the Senate of Marseilles, in accordance with a law borrowed from Greece, and given to those persons who could justify their death by sufficient reasons, the authorities thereby wishing to prevent hasty and too frequent suicides. Plato, Aristotle, and many of the wise men condemned suicide, some as unjust to God, others as wrong towards the State; but, as Mr. Lecky says, 'a general approval of it floated down through most of the schools of philosophy, and even to those who condemned it, it never seems to have assumed its present aspect of enormity.' The Stoicks generally, in spite of their high moral ideal, their patriotic virtue, their superiority to the surrounding conditions in which they lived, and their grand notions respecting the dignity of man, resisting the world, the ascendancy of reason, and the virtue of action, were tainted with the immoral doctrine of the lawfulness of suicide. Cato was their ideal man. As Pliny extolled the bounty of Providence because it had filled the world with herbs whereby the weary could procure a rapid and painless death, so Seneca riots in the idea that there are many ways by which the weary and the slave can break their chains. 'Against all the injuries of life,' he says, 'I have the refuge of death. Wherever you look there is the end of evils. You see that yawning precipice—there you may descend to liberty. You see that sea, that river, that well—liberty sits at the bottom. Do you seek the way to freedom? You may find it in every vein of your body. . . . Man should seek the approbation of others in his life; his death concerns only himself. . . . The lot of man is happy, because no one continues wretched but by his own fault. If life pleases you, live. If not, you have a right to return whence you came.' Epictetus and Musonius wrote in the same strain; and even Marcus Aurelius, who condemned suicide, recognised its rightfulness in some cases, especially to prevent moral degeneracy. There was no want of sympathy here between the philosophers and the people. Suicides were common, often dramatic, and some-

times took place amidst a group of admiring friends.\* When Otho killed himself to avoid being a second time the cause of civil war (A.D. 69), some of his soldiers killed themselves before his corpse to testify their admiration, and Tacitus declares that others, not present, did the same when they heard the news. Tullius Marcellinus, afflicted with an incurable disease, sought the advice of a philosopher, who recommended suicide, which advice Marcellinus gladly embraced. He was 'a young man of remarkable abilities and very earnest character,' says Mr. Lecky. There were only two laws against suicide in the Roman Empire in pagan times; Domitian, to prevent suicide before trial, ordaining that it should entail exposure of the body and confiscation of goods, exactly the same as condemnation; and Hadrian assimilating suicide to desertion, a step similar to that taken by Napoleon in 1802 to check suicide amongst his soldiers. 'With these exceptions the liberty appears to have been absolute,' and we learn from Ulpian that the wills of suicides were recognised by law. The custom of burying the suicide after sunset is of Jewish origin.

What were the causes of this conception of suicide as a euthanasia? Two at once suggest themselves. The absence of all idea of sin from the stoical morality, and the notion of death as the end of sorrow, and of a future life as little more than a beautiful uncertainty. Death was viewed as 'a law and not a punishment,' and the whole course of stoical teaching was intended to clear the mind of shame or fear. Thus, to give Mr. Lecky's convenient epitome:—

'The doctrine of suicide was the culminating point of Roman stoicism. The proud, self-reliant, unbending character of the philosopher could only be sustained when he felt that he had a sure refuge against the extreme forms of suffering or despair. Although virtue is not a mere creature of interest, no great system has ever yet flourished which did not present an ideal of happiness as well as of duty. Stoicism taught men to hope little but to fear nothing. It did not array death in brilliant colours, as the path to positive felicity, but it endeavoured to divest it, as the end of suffering, of every terror. Life lost much of its bitterness when men had found a refuge from the storms of fate, a speedy deliverance from torture and pain. Death ceased to be terrible when it was regarded rather as a remedy than a sentence. Life and death were attuned to the same key. . . . The type of its own kind was perfect. All the virtues and all the majesty that accompany human pride, when developed to the highest point, and directed to the noblest ends, were here displayed. All those which accompany humility and self-abasement were absent.'

The first emphatic condemnation of suicide, on grounds personal to the victim, was made by Neo-Platonism. It was

\* Hegesias of Alexandria was called the 'orator of death' because he preached suicide. He was banished by Ptolemy.

Plotinus who taught that as perturbation polluted the soul, the spirit of the suicide left his body with a stain upon it. Christianity extended this doctrine, and registered, in the earliest days of the Church, a most emphatic condemnation of the act. This is the more remarkable as the New Testament contains no direct positive precept against suicide, and the opportunity referred to in John viii., 22, does not seem to have been taken to include self-slaughter with the commandment against murder spiritualised in Matt. v., 22. The early Church, however, made no distinction between murder and suicide, except where the latter followed the intoxicated desire for martyrdom common to early converts, or was resorted to, under extreme circumstances, by women to guard their chastity. In the two latter cases they excused it, and on many occasions expressed high admiration of those who preferred death to shame, whilst hesitating to justify the suicide itself. The doctrine of the penal nature of death, the duty of resignation to pain and evil as elements of moral discipline, and above all the clear conception of a future life affected by the good or evil of the present one, all contributed to make direct and deliberate suicide a crime, and banish it from the Church. The Circumcelliones, the Albigenses, and in later times the Jews were driven by various causes to practise it; the first for the sake of salvation, the second to accelerate death in illness, and the third to avoid persecution and torture. No direct change in legislation was made until the sixth century, when the Council of Bragues ordained that no religious rites should be celebrated at the tomb of the suicide, and no masses said for his soul.

'St. Lewis originated the custom of confiscating the property of the dead man, and the corpse was soon subject to gross and various outrages. In some countries it could only be removed from the house through a perforation specially made for the occasion in the wall; it was dragged upon the hurdle through the streets, hung up with the head downwards, and at last thrown into the public sewer, or burnt, or buried in the sand below high-water mark, or transfixed by a stake on the public highway.'

We need not wonder that suicide should have been almost unknown under the empire of Catholicism and Mahomedanism, it being expressly condemned by name in the Koran, whereas the Bible supplies us with no positive prohibition. The later history of society shows that the moral repulsion felt towards the crime was lessened by the revival of classical studies; some partial apologies were even made for it in England in the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century. The magistrates and priests of Sir Thomas More's

'Utopia' are represented as permitting and occasionally enjoining the suicide of those afflicted with incurable diseases. Dr. Donne, the eccentric dean of St. Paul's, wrote a defence of self-homicide, under the title of 'Bathanus.' It is of this work that he wrote to Lord Antrim: 'Reserve it for me if I live, and if I die I only forbid it the press and the fire. Publish it not, but burn it not, but between those do what you like with it.' Blount and Creech, two classic editors of now European renown, were apologists for suicide, and both thus ended their existence. 'When I have finished my commentary I must kill myself,' Creech wrote on the margin of his translation of Lucretius; and he kept his word. Montesquieu and Rousseau defended suicide, as did Holbach and Deslandes, and Voltaire admitted its rightfulness in cases of necessity. Madame de Staël, who had commended suicide in a youthful work, devoted a later one to a tender and pious declaration of its incompatibility with anything like virtue. 'Though there are many crimes of a deeper dye than suicide,' she writes in her 'Réflexions,' 'there is no other by which men appear so formally to renounce the protection of God.' This, indeed, strengthened by considerations as to the future of the soul, and the general belief in the sanctity of all human life, is found more operative in preventing suicide than peaceful and prosperous times, laws confiscating property, the unchristian burial that follows a verdict of *felo de se*, or the 'general conditions of society.' The case of suicide is indeed a strong one in favour of a moral growth almost wholly independent of really intellectual advance. An obscure member of one of the most obscure religious sects of our land feels a repugnance to suicide which is due to an increase in the moral acquisitions of the race, and not to any superiority of intelligence or any scientific advance. A rude Cornish miner is in this respect in advance of Seneca or Epictetus, though he would be unable to blurt out more than one or two insufficient reasons for his belief. In fine, the law of inherited capacities is as much moral as intellectual in its operation.

Before we pass to our second topic we ought to say a word or two on infanticide. Like suicide, this was a classic crime, and even where laws were enacted against it, and a distinction made between it and exposure, they were constantly and easily evaded. It will not fail to be noted as extraordinary that Chremes, in Terence, who utters the memorable line, '*Homo sum humani nihil a me alienum puto*', reproaches his wife for having exposed her little girl instead of having it

killed, as he had advised.\* Abortion and infanticide were both checked by the theology of the early Church. A mother who believed that the soul of her infant was damned if it died unbaptised, or unblessed, was not likely to destroy it, or yet to stain her own soul with the guilt of murder. Infanticide was made a capital offence by Valentinian, in A.D. 374, and the early Christians were noted for their care and love for unfortunate foundlings. Moral feeling, however, rather than legislative restriction, has been the principal agent in so incorporating an idea of the sanctity of infant life with our modern notions as to make it 'independent of all doctrinal changes.'

'If the hammer and the shuttle could move themselves, slavery would be unnecessary.' This was Aristotle's opinion, and is accepted almost as prophecy by those who imagine that the revolutions of invention and labour are the main causes of the decrease of slavery and our detestation of the system. We are quite willing, however, to admit several initial facts respecting slavery:—First, that slave-holding was an advance upon the savage method of killing captives taken in war; secondly, that slave labour was an indispensable element in early half-military, half-agricultural, and half-industrial life; and thirdly, as M. Comte happily puts it, that 'labour, accepted at first as a ransom of life, became afterwards the' (we prefer to read, a) 'principle of emancipation.' Having made these admissions, we pass on to deal with Roman slavery, and as its main features are well-known, we need make no apology for any scantiness of detail. Mr. Lecky divides it into three periods. 1. The form that existed in the earlier and simpler days of the Republic, when the head of the family had few slaves, was absolute master of them, and lived in intimate connection with them. On all religious festivals the slaves were exempt from field labour, and on the Saturnalia and Matronalia they sat at the same table as their masters. 2. The period after the servile wars of Sicily, the revolt of Spartacus, and the passion for gladiatorial shows. This was the worst age of Roman slavery, as the proverb, 'As many enemies as slaves,' fully testified. When a master was murdered without evidence being forthcoming as to the criminal, the whole of his slaves were put to death. When Pedamus was murdered the people rose in

\* The authority of the parent was once much higher than it is now. Thus, under the Roman Law, a man might order his son to be slain, and in Deut. xxi., 18 to 21, it is stated that the rebellious son shall be brought to the gate and stoned to death. Compare with these, the shooting of his son to avoid disgrace by the hero of Uncle Roland's Tale in Chap. vi. of Bulwer's 'Caxtons.'

revolt against the law, which condemned his four hundred slaves, but the soldiers interfered and the men were executed. Torture, working in chains, and other devices were resorted to by the masters, and when they chose to get rid of a slave they could have a choice of three methods :—if infirm, expose him on an island of the Tiber ; but if able-bodied, flog him within an inch of his life—plead necessity, and so escape all punishment ; or sell him for the gladiatorial shows. Only in cases of incest, murder, &c., were slaves permitted to give evidence, and then only when their testimony was indispensable. Several deviations from modern slavery should be borne in mind. A Roman slave could marry ; families were rarely separated ; slaves held private property and accumulated savings, which they were frequently allowed to dispose of by will ; and enfranchisement, by these moneys, or the kindness of masters, was common. 3. The next period commences after the enactment of the Petronian law, forbidding a master to condemn a slave to fight with wild beasts without the sentence of a judge. Nero, Domitian, the Antonines, and Hadrian passed laws still further improving the lot of Roman slaves. A judge was appointed to hear their complaints ; mutilation was forbidden ; and stringent regulations were enforced against all undue severity, and the existence of *ergastula*, or private prisons. Very little was done by subsequent legislation until the time of Justinian, who removed restrictions upon enfranchisement, and desired to encourage manumission ; the class of freed-men was virtually abolished, and, with the authorisation of his master, a slave was permitted to marry a free woman, his children becoming legal heirs. Here, however, the direct stream of moral influence begins to be felt. The Christian Church recognised slavery ; but it brought the slave and the free man into new relations ; gave moral dignity to the servile class, and commenced a public movement in favour of enfranchisement. The law recognised distinctions that were lost in the Church. Slave and free sat together, partook of the sacred elements, mingled in the same worship. The chastity of the female slave was zealously guarded by the Church. The priestly office was not barred by colour or lowly birth, and hence multitudes of emancipated slaves entered into ecclesiastical offices, administering consolation or the symbols of the crucifixion to their once lordly masters.\* The virtues of the servile class

\* A law of Henry II. enacted that every Saxon serf who could get ordained should thenceforth be amenable to none but ecclesiastic law. It was this that led to the enormous multiplication of the clergy after the conquest.—Thierry, Vol. V., p. 58.

were also recognised and exalted by Christianity. ‘Humility, obedience, gentleness, resignation, are all cardinal virtues in the Christian character; they were all neglected or underrated by the Pagans, they can all expand and flourish in a servile state.’ Hence slavery was in correspondence with the group of virtues prevailing after the sixth century. Stoicism asserted the equality of all men, but made no effort to do more than mitigate the condition of the slave. Christianity admitted slavery, but in admitting it consecrated the virtues it developed, spread amongst them with electric charm, and finally made emancipation a Christian duty, and initiated a movement which has culminated in our time. Church ornaments were sold to rescue slaves from thraldom, especially captives, and the deeds of St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great, St. Cæsarius, St. Exuperius, St. Hilary, St. Remi, St. Cyprian, St. Epiphanius, St. Avitus, St. Peter Teleonarius, and St. Serapion are well-known to ecclesiastical history, the two latter having sold themselves into slavery to redeem others when all their means were exhausted. The influence of religion was continued in another form, when monachism, by its association of high character and virtue with simple labour, deprived menial occupations of their presumed degradation, and led on to an industrialism which has made slavery incompatible with civilisation. Though late as 1775 the colliers of Scotland were bound in perpetual servitude to the places at which they worked,\* we have long since come to have a horror of human servitude that might be called instinctive, did we not know it has been the result of ages of moral growth, and is wholly incompatible with the group of virtues that characterises the industrial epoch—*independence, veracity, self-assertion, unity of class.*

We have not much space left to devote to our third example of accumulative moral feeling—kindness to animals. It is a subject in itself. But it can hardly be passed over in silence. There are abundant illustrations of delicacy of feeling towards some particular animal to be found in ancient times, without anything like the organised sensitiveness we feel in our own day. Thus, the most useful animals speedily became objects of veneration, as the cow in India, the bull in Egypt, whilst many legends, and especially the Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of souls, led to a tender regard for some of the tamer animals. The ox, indeed, was in all countries supposed to be exempt from cruel treatment, and especially in Palestine. Still, except amongst the Hebrew races, there was an

---

\* See note to Mc.Culloch's edition of the *Wealth of Nations*, Vol. II., p. 186.

absence of anything like humanity towards animals generally. In Greece, cock-fighting, quail-fighting, and bull-fights were common, and encouraged by the law, as supplying the people with examples of valour. Chrysippus maintained that on this ground cock-fighting was the final cause of cocks. The combats with wild beasts in the Roman amphitheatre were also examples of callousness which Christianity speedily set itself to diminish. But just as the Church corporate checked suicide, infanticide, and slavery, whilst monachism, or the third development of Christianity, dignified labour, so its second form, asceticism, seems to have developed a new feeling towards the animal creation. The eremite sought to live a purely natural or Edenic life, and regain something of lost power over himself and natural forms. Banished from men he sank insensibly into the rank of animal life, superior yet akin, the blossom yet still in connection with the rude stem. Thus the legends of the saints are full of touching pictures of this intimacy. No one supposes they are all true, but at least they have this amount of truth in them—they are attempts, often grotesque enough, to represent a fact, and had a marvellous influence in softening character. When birds and domestic animals were associated with the piety of this or that saint, they were certain to be exempt from cruelty. An Irish peasant is kind to his pig for two reasons, because it is his rent-payer, and because St. Bridget made one her constant companion. In one or two cases our modern attachment to birds may be traced to some of the Catholic legends. Everybody in England looks kindly on the robin, but very few can give a reason why. It may be that it is viewed as the swallow is, in the light of 'a scholar of God,' as the old rhyme says, teaching us the seasons; but there are two legends about it which may account for some of the superstitious reverence entertained for it. The first is, that God commissioned the robin to carry a drop of water to the souls of un-baptised infants in hell, and that its breast was singed in piercing the flames. The other is, that for pure pity's sake, it strove to pull out the thorns from the crown of Christ, and hence bears His sacred blood upon its breast to the present day. Similarly, we may account for the irreverent way in which the cock was treated in old English sports. It was far from being what the Lombardy peasant calls the swallow—'the chicken of the Lord'; it was a vile bird, the symbol of Peter's denial, and the fitting sport of Christian people. As early as the twelfth century cock-fighting was an English pastime, and continued to be so till the beginning of the nineteenth. James I. was particularly fond of the sport.

'Cock-throwing' was another cruel English game, chiefly practised on Shrove Tuesday. Sir Thomas More, the author of 'Utopia,' was famous for his skill in throwing the 'cock-stick.' The sport was suppressed in 1769. Bear-baiting and bull-baiting continued much longer. Windham and Canning defended the latter, as did even Sir Robert Peel, in 1824. The rise of the theatre in England, as in Rome, was a principal cause of the suppression of cruel sports, but the gentle lives of the hermits, and the softened natures of Christian persons, contributed much to plant within us our present strong feelings in spite of the interruptions occasioned by military conquest and the successive revivals of military passion.

Here we must close. Mr. Lecky's last chapter on 'the Position of Women' is full of interest, and inspires us with a hope that he will give us yet other works in which the same exhaustive research, kindly spirit, and strong common sense will be shown. It is the only chapter in which a special aspect of sociology is fully worked out, and it rather makes us regret that the same plan was not adopted with such topics as we have used his researches to place in the light of moral science.

---

#### THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN RELATION TO LABOUR AND CAPITAL.

HOW is the material prosperity of the country affected by the public and almost unrestrained sale of liquors, and by the consequent drinking habits which prevail to such an unfortunate and disgraceful extent among the masses of our fellow-countrymen? This is the question proposed to be discussed in the following paragraphs. We shall not here dilate upon its importance, because the magnitude and variety of the interests that are involved in this great social question will unfold themselves in their natural order, and with inevitable precision and effect, as we proceed. It will be seen that it is a question so deeply concerning the welfare of society,—even those broad and primary principles which are the groundwork and foundation of modern society, and so vital to the character, prosperity, and lasting greatness of our country, that there can be no subject more worthy of the close investigation and most serious attention of politicians. The statesman who shall triumph over the difficulties that surround and beset at every step the satisfactory solution of this great social problem, and shall cast out the terrible evils that it inflicts

upon the country, will receive the benediction of his own generation, and, dying, will be enshrined in the blessings of posterity,—

'And so sepulchred in such pomp [shall] lie  
That kings for such a tomb would wish to die.'

In order to show more clearly how the wide-spread custom of drinking affects the material progress of the nation, we will briefly state some of the causes of our prosperity and greatness. It will then be seen that this vice, that has hitherto defied all the eloquence of the moralist and the utmost authority of the pulpit, is weakening the energies and corrupting the very heart's core of our country.

The wealth and prosperity of a nation depend, like those of an individual, upon three great causes—efficiency of labour, accumulation of capital, natural agents. These causes are, in turn, operated upon by other and subordinate causes or influences. Whatever tends to increase the force and efficacy, and to quicken the energy and vitality of any of these causes, must tend, in an equal degree, to promote the development of the national resources, and to accelerate the growth of wealth and prosperity. And whatever, on the other hand, tends to weaken or diminish their power, must, in the same degree, obstruct and diminish the progress of wealth and prosperity. Now of the numerous subordinate causes or influences conducive to one or other of these tendencies, our subject and purpose confine us to one, viz., the influence of the liquor traffic. We shall see how this traffic affects in a multitude of ways, directly and indirectly, the two first great causes, the efficiency of labour and the accumulation of capital. We will first notice its effects upon the efficiency of labour.

It is self-evident that the greater are the strength, the powers of endurance, the energy, skill, perseverance, and intelligence which the workman exercises in his employment, the more effective will be the labour, the more perfect the result, the more valuable the workman. When the work to be done requires great physical strength, anything that impairs that strength would be shunned by a prudent workman. If extraordinary powers of endurance are essential, as in a campaign, where the soldier must suffer exposure to the inclemency of the weather, must perform forced marches in a difficult country, harassed by the enemy, wasted by an inhospitable climate, worn out by fatigue, constantly obliged to confront innumerable hardships and dangers, anything that would detract from those powers of endurance would be more fatal, because more sure, than the shots of the enemy.

Examples can be multiplied without end by everyone. For there is not a single occupation in life in which the qualities above-named are not of the greatest use.

The indulgence of immoderate drinking, which is inseparable from the present system of the almost unrestrained sale of intoxicating beverages, carries with it its own punishment in the poverty, ruin, and degradation which lay waste the house of the drunkard. A shattered constitution, premature old age, moral abasement, bodily and intellectual debility fill his cup of misery to the brim. The common experience of every-day life attest the truth of this short description of the unhappy lot of him who has yielded to the coarse seductions of the beerhouse. But the sum total of the wretchedness cannot be ascertained. Yet some idea may be formed of it from the statistical returns of our cities and towns. Let any one refer to the local papers of Liverpool: he will often find as many as two hundred convictions in one day for offences arising from drunkenness. The presiding magistrates at quarter sessions trace nine-tenths of the criminal cases that come before them to the door of the public-house. The testimony of the judges on circuit, both in their charges to the grand jury and in the more minute criticisms they afterwards make upon each individual case, is no less emphatic. Their acuteness, sharpened by long practice, in sifting evidence, their high and responsible position, the dignity of their office, and the renown of their reputation clothe with irresistible force the solemn and deliberate expression of their unanimous opinion. The frequenters of the public-house are either weakened for their work, which thereby becomes less efficient, or a still greater misfortune befalls them, and they are cut off, by a verdict of guilty, from earning an honourable livelihood. General Havelock strongly animadverted upon the evil effects of the soldiers' indulgence in drink in Cabul. Military inefficiency, military offences, and the wreck of the most robust constitutions in the army are notoriously the result of drunkenness and its consequent debauchery. History truly ascribes to this indulgence the failure of our first armament in the great American war. The terrible results of this insane national vice, encouraged by the fiscal arrangements of the Government, are written, to our shame, in the imperishable records of the national losses and public calamities.

But drinking has a far more dangerous and fatal effect. It enervates the understanding, weakens the powers of the mind, dulls the intellect, and quenches the brilliance of the divine ray of intelligence which, raising man into a different

and higher order of being than the rest of the creation, marks him the noblest work of God, and enlightens and illumines the soul with a light as superior to the light of the sun as the spiritual is superior to the material order. It is this degradation of the sublime part of man that is the greatest curse attached to drunkenness. What a shock to the order—the cosmos—of our being! If the creatures of the earth tremble in terror when the source of her life and light is partially eclipsed, how fallen must be the state of that man who sees, careless and unmoved, the more appalling eclipse of his own more divine intelligence!

Everyone is aware how invaluable in an economical point of view is superior intelligence. What a saving in a large mercantile or manufacturing establishment can often be effected by one man of a high order of intelligence placed at the helm! The effects of extensive knowledge, great skill, and high intelligence, are too familiar to everyone, and too well appreciated, even by the most uneducated, to require illustration. They are apparent in the competition of various nations, where there is a striking contrast to our disadvantage. Mr. Escher, of Zurich, a large employer of working men of many different nations, gave the following evidence, which is annexed to the Poor Law Commissioners' Report, in 1840:—

---

'The Italians' quickness of perception is shown in rapidly comprehending any new descriptions of labour put into their hands, in a power of quickly comprehending the meaning of their employer, of adapting themselves to new circumstances, much beyond what any other classes have. The French workmen have the like natural characteristics, only in a somewhat lower degree. The English, Swiss, German, and Dutch workmen, we find, have all much slower natural comprehension. As workmen *only* the preference is undoubtedly due to the English; because, as we find them, they are all trained to special branches, on which they have had comparatively superior training, and have concentrated all their thoughts. As men of business or of general usefulness, or as men with whom an employer would best like to be surrounded, I should, however, decidedly prefer the Saxons and the Swiss; but more especially the Saxons, because they have had a very careful general education, which has extended their capabilities beyond any special employment, and rendered them fit to take up, after a short preparation, any employment to which they may be called. If I have an English workman engaged in the erection of a steam engine, he will understand that and nothing else; and for other circumstances or other branches of mechanics however closely allied, he will be comparatively helpless to adapt himself to all the circumstances that may arise, to make arrangements for them, and to give sound advice or write clear statements and letters on his work in the various related branches of mechanics. The better educated workmen, we find, are distinguished by superior moral habits in every respect. In the first place they are entirely sober; they are discreet in their enjoyments, which are of a more rational and refined kind; they have a taste for much better society, which they approach respectfully, and, consequently, find much readier admittance to it; they cultivate music; they read; they enjoy the pleasures of scenery, and make parties for excursions in the country; they are economical, and their economy extends beyond their own purse to the stock of their master; they are, consequently, honest and trustworthy.'

In answer to a question respecting the English workmen, he said :—

‘ Whilst in respect to the work to which they have been especially trained they are the most skilful, they are in conduct the most disorderly, debauched, and unruly, and least respectable and trustworthy of any nation whatsoever whom we have employed ; and in saying this I express the opinion of every manufacturer on the continent to whom I have spoken, and especially of the English manufacturers, who make the loudest complaint. These characteristics of depravity do not apply to the English workmen who have received an education, but attach to the others in the degree in which they are in want of it.’

Here is a character of our fellow-countrymen, which, whilst it passes a well-merited and generously-given eulogium upon the sober and the educated, speaks of the others in terms too dreadful, but too true, to require comment. The working-man who spends his money in the public-house cannot have the money to educate his children. Wherefore it too often happens that the unfortunate children, demoralised by the example of their father, follow in his footsteps, a curse to everyone to whom they ought to be a blessing, a curse to themselves, their parents, their family, and their country. It is impossible not to make the reflection that among all the nations mentioned by Mr. Escher the English are most addicted to drinking.

Enough has now been said to make it clear that the liquor traffic, being inevitably and inseparably associated with drunkenness, is, in the highest degree, prejudicial to, and destructive of, the efficiency of labour in every path of life—whether the labour be mental or manual. But even if we had no drunkenness ; if every member of the State had his appetite under such complete and wholesome restraint as never to indulge in the slightest excess ; still, though moralists were satisfied with this, the statesman and patriot would require something more. For even then a large consumption of liquors would be fraught with evil ; it would still be a cup of poison to the nation, and its effects would not be the less disastrous because less obvious. They would be seen, and noted, and regretted by those who break the crust of society, and examine its interior and hidden strata. Those social explorers would discover that the mere production of drink is injurious. This leads us at once to the purely economic results of its manufacture and trade, which, it may be alleged, apparently in its favour, support a vast amount of labour. The quality of that labour, however, will presently be discovered. For this purpose we must refer to some of the primary principles of political economy.

The first great principle in connection with labour, is that

it does not produce objects, but utilities. All the labour in the world, with all the power of man combined, could never call into being an object. It could never produce material. All that it can do, and what it does, is to take the objects—the materials—nature has provided, and, by re-arranging these, and placing them in new and artificial positions, to cause them to assume properties by which, from having been useless to us, they become useful. In other words, labour produces, as the greatest of the French political economists, M. Say, has aptly termed it, utilities. Like all other species of labour, that which is employed in the liquor traffic is undoubtedly producing utilities, or rather, were we inclined to be facetious, we should say *inutilities*. But is all labour that produces utilities to be accounted productive? This is a question, and a very important one, asked by M. Say and others. The answer to it will depend upon what is meant by productive labour. Productive labour, in the language of political economy and the language of reality, is labour employed in investing external material things with properties which render them serviceable to human beings. Now, how do intoxicating liquors stand the test of this great definition? Take beer, for example. Barley and hops are the chief 'external material things' operated upon. Does the process of brewing invest these 'external material things' with properties that render them serviceable to human beings?' This question has been sufficiently alluded to above; but for a further and more lucid exposition upon that particular, read two short and interesting statements, one by Henry Munro, M.D., entitled, 'Alcohol not Food'; the other, by J. MacKenzie, M.D., headed, 'Condensed Temperance Facts for Christians.' That brewing does not invest the materials for beer with any 'properties that render them serviceable to human beings,' would be quite enough to establish the unproductive quality of the labour of brewing, without insisting that the properties of beer are actually unserviceable, detrimental, and injurious to the welfare of individuals and society. But at least, it is objected, they produce enjoyment. Certainly; such enjoyment as enfeebles and degrades human nature. What an enjoyment! Is it too great a restraint upon personal liberty to forbid and prevent, to repress by strong measures, the enjoyment, which is only another name for degradation and crime? It is done already in (so far as principle is concerned) analogous cases. There are indulgences which it is a grave offence against the criminal law, as well as against society, to gratify. And is there—can there be a more flagrant offence against society than the

nightly scenes of drunkenness and debauchery which disgrace every beerhouse in the kingdom, demoralising the people, polluting society ? There are, we have said, indulgences which we handcuff, notwithstanding the sacred principle of personal freedom. But there is no indulgence which so urgently requires strong restraint and repressive measures as the liquor traffic.

Suppose the indulgence gave solid enjoyment, and, as such, was beneficial ; still the labour would be unproductive. Mr. Mill lays it down that ' all labour is unproductive which ends in immediate enjoyment, without any increase of the accumulated stock of permanent means of enjoyment.' If a rich man lays out a handsome flower garden, or builds a conservatory, to be stocked with rare and beautiful plants, he derives permanent enjoyment from the labour. Or, if a poor man increases the conveniences and comforts of his home, here, too, is a source of permanent enjoyment. But where is the permanent enjoyment of money spent in the public-house ? What does even the immediate enjoyment consist of but quarrels, sickness, and headache? True, Mr. Mill adds, a little further on, ' unproductive may be as useful as productive labour ; it may be more useful, even in point of permanent advantage.' And when this is the case, no one in his senses would think of saying a word against it. Mr. Mill continues : ' Or its use may consist only in pleasurable sensation, which when gone, leaves no trace ; or it may not afford even this, but may be absolute waste. In any case society, or mankind, grow no richer by it, but poorer.' We will leave it to those who imbibe freely to describe the ' pleasurable sensation ' of drinking ; and proceed to examine whether this species of unproductive labour is not ' absolute waste.'

The last words we quoted from Mr. Mill make it incumbent upon all unproductive labour to have a strong ground of defence :—' in any case society, or mankind grow no richer by it, but poorer.' One of the commonest and best defences is summed up in the proverb, ' All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy.' But this is obviously inapplicable to the public-house ; for when a man leaves it he is less fit for work than when he entered. We omit from consideration here the ' absolute waste ' of the barley ; the ' absolute waste ' of those extensive tracts of land that are withdrawn from the cultivation of wheat in order to grow barley and hops for beer. We omit these items, although they are not trifles, when we consider that they would employ and feed all the beggars in the streets ; whereas, instead, they are actually swelling the numbers of those very beggars, by indirectly impoverishing the consumers of beer at the public-houses.

The liquor traffic, however, involves a greater source of poverty to the nation than the destruction of the products of the earth. All the *labour* engaged in the traffic, from the breweries to the retail shops, is 'absolute waste.' Instead of producing that which is the poison of society, it ought to be spinning and weaving cloth for clothes, making bricks and building houses for the poor. It ought to be engaged in a thousand different useful arts. 'But,' some one suggests, 'does it not often happen that our warehouses are overstocked with goods, that the mills are slack, that there are already too many spinners and weavers, too many bricklayers and masons?' Our mills are slack, our warehouses overstocked, because the money that should buy the goods for clothes is spent at the public-house. Bricklayers and masons and joiners are too numerous, because the savings which should enable the poor to live in better houses are 'absolutely wasted' at the beerhouse. 'But,' it is urged again, 'the money has only changed hands; it is not wasted. It has passed from the poor man to the publican: an innumerable multitude of publicans, like the slaves of Egypt, have been constantly carrying it to the breweries, where they have erected mighty pyramids of gold—the colossal fortunes of London, Burton-upon-Trent, and Dublin brewers.' This objection is very specious. Few writers on political economy are free from it. It arises from the habit of confounding money with wealth. Money is not wealth; it is only the representative of wealth. We habitually speak of it as wealth, because it will procure for us a superfluous abundance of the necessaries, comforts, and luxuries of life, and these are wealth. Coins are merely the counters of society. But so difficult is it to emancipate our understandings from the trammels in which they are confined by the perpetual use of customary phrases, that political economists themselves often write as if money and wealth were synonymous. It is a plentiful supply of necessaries, comforts, and luxuries that constitutes wealth. These can only exist through labour, and the more labour there is employed in producing them, the more plentiful will they be, and the more truly wealthy will be the nation. So that if the labour that is at present producing beer were producing something necessary or more useful, the nation would be so much the more wealthy. For instance, suppose it were employed in making clothes or building houses for the ragged, half-naked, and houseless poor, is it not clear that the nation would be possessed of a larger aggregate stock of necessaries and comforts, in other words that it would be richer, than it is at present? And this is what would really happen if the drink

trade were suppressed, because the money that is now spent in the beerhouse—that is, in supporting so much unproductive labour—would then be placed in the Post Office Savings Bank, to be withdrawn thence to buy clothes, or to enable the mass of the people to be better housed—that is, in supporting as much productive labour as would make the clothes and the increased house accommodation. Thus the labour bestowed upon beer is an ‘absolute waste,’ a positive loss to the nation.

It remains to point out the principles which regulate the amount of this loss. This may appear very easy; it may be thought to lie on the surface. At first sight it would appear that the amount of the loss is equivalent to the amount of labour bestowed in the liquor trade. Let us see if this superficial view is correct.

It has been demonstrated by Mr. Mill that capital is essential to production; that without it ‘no productive operations beyond the rude and scanty beginnings of primitive industry are possible;’ that, consequently, ‘industry and productions are limited by capital;’ that, ‘while on the one hand industry is limited by capital, so on the other every increase of capital gives, or is capable of giving, additional employment to industry, and this without assignable limit.’ These are the most elementary principles of political economy; they are some of the fundamental propositions on capital. From them it follows that a great destruction or loss of capital, such as often precedes a commercial panic, is not only ruinous to the individuals whose operations have proved abortive, but is also a national calamity, inasmuch as it narrows the limits of industry, and contracts the sphere of labour. Hence a dearth of employment, labour markets overstocked, the numbers of the poor increased by multitudes, bad trade, shoals of beggars,—hard times. A reflection upon the nature of capital, on what it really is, will satisfy all of the truth of these propositions, and that the disastrous results just alluded to must inevitably follow when any catastrophe happens to it. To put it in the simplest form,—it is quite clear that no labour can be performed without a sufficient stock of food to keep the labourer in health and strength whilst he is at work, and without the necessary tools and implements. These implements and food are the saved result of previous labour. They have been saved, accumulated from past labour to maintain future labour. This saving or accumulation is capital. So that without it, it may be a very small, or it may be a very large quantity, it is evident no labour is possible. It follows that the larger this capital—this accumulated stock of necessities—the

more labour and labourers it will support. Thus, industry is limited by capital; the more capital we have, the more industry we shall have. Now, this being so, is the labour employed in the liquor trade the sum total of the national loss; or is there an additional loss (to the nation, we mean, for the individual gains) in the capital sunk in such trade? To answer this, suppose (any hypothesis is permissible for the purposes of an argument) that the whole of the liquor trade, including all, but no more than, the capital and labour therein employed, were swept from the face of the earth, leaving all other social arrangements *in statu quo*; what would follow? Simply this. Capital and labour, in all other trades, being untouched and undisturbed, would continue to employ and to be employed exactly as before. But what would the nation lose by the supposed annihilation of the labour and capital engaged in the liquor traffic? It would lose, first, the labour which, had it not been swept away, would have begun to produce something useful to mankind; and, second, the capital which, had it not been annihilated, would have begun to give employment to other labour. As regards that other employment, and particularly productive labour, as regards the wealth of the nation, the capital and labour laid out in the liquor traffic are as utterly useless, as completely annihilated, as in the supposition we have made.

Not only is the capital useless, but the result is still more aggravated. The large expenditure upon beer, etc., affects the interests of the labouring classes even beyond the visible abstraction of money from their pockets. To put this in as clear a light as possible, we will borrow, and transpose, an illustration from Mr. Mill's work on political economy. A consumer may expend his income either in buying services or commodities. He may employ part of it in hiring spinners, weavers, and tailors, to make clothes; or he may expend the same value in buying spirits and beer. The question is, whether the difference between these two modes of expending his income affects the interest of the labouring classes. It is plain that, in the first of the two cases, he employs labourers who will be out of employment, or at least out of that employment, in the opposite case. But those from whom we differ say that this is of no consequence, because, in buying spirits and beer, he equally employs labourers, namely, those who make the spirits and beer. We contend, however, that in this last case he does not employ labourers, but merely decides in what kind of work some other person shall employ them. The consumer does not, with his own funds, pay to the labourers in the breweries and distilleries their day's

wages. He buys the manufactured commodity, which has been produced by labour and capital, the labour not being paid, nor the capital furnished, by him, but by the brewer. Suppose that he had been in the habit of expending this portion of his income in hiring spinners, weavers, and tailors, who laid out the amount of their wages in food and clothing, which were also produced by labour and capital. He, however, determines to prefer spirits and beer, for which he thus creates an extra demand. This demand cannot be satisfied without an extra supply, nor can the supply be produced without an extra capital. Whence, then, is the capital to come? There is nothing in the consumer's change of purpose which makes the capital of the country greater than it was. It appears, then, that the increased demand for spirits and beer could not for the present be supplied, were it not that the very circumstance that gave rise to it has set at liberty a capital of the exact amount required. The very sum which the consumer now employs in buying spirits and beer, formerly passed into the hands of spinners, and weavers, and tailors, who expended it in food and necessaries, which they now either go without, or squeeze by their competition from the shares of other labourers. The labour and capital, therefore, which formerly produced necessaries for the use of these spinners and weavers, are deprived of their market, and must look out for other employment; and they find it in making spirits and beer for the new demand. We do not mean that the very same capital and labour which produced the necessities turn themselves to producing the spirits and beer; but, in some one or another of a hundred modes, they take the place of that which does. There was capital in existence to do one of two things—to make the beer, or to produce necessities for the spinners and weavers; but not to do both. It was at the option of the consumer which of the two should happen; and if he chooses the beer, they go without the necessities.

For further illustration, let us suppose the same case reversed. The consumer has been accustomed to buy beer, but resolves to discontinue that expense, and to employ the same annual sum in hiring spinners and weavers. If the common opinion be correct, this change in the mode of his expenditure gives no additional employment to labour, but only transfers employment from the labourers in the breweries and distilleries to the spinners and weavers in the mills. On closer inspection, however, it will be seen that there is an increase of the total sum applied to the remuneration of labour. The brewer, supposing him aware of the diminished demand for

his commodity, diminishes the production, and sets at liberty a corresponding portion of the capital employed in the brewing. This capital, thus withdrawn from the maintenance of the labourers in the brewery, is not the same fund with that which the customer employs in maintaining spinners and weavers; it is a second fund. There are, therefore, two funds to be employed in the maintenance and remuneration of labour, where before there was only one. There is not a transfer of employment from brewers to spinners; there is a new employment for spinners, and a transfer of employment from brewers to some other labourers, most probably those who produce food and other things which the spinners consume.

In answer to this it is said, that though money laid out in buying beer, is not capital, it replaces capital; that though it does not create a new demand for labour, it is the necessary means of enabling the existing demand to be kept up. The funds (it may be said) of the brewer, while locked up in beer, cannot be directly applied to the maintenance of labour; they do not begin to constitute a demand for labour until the beer is sold, and the capital which made it replaced from the outlay of the purchaser; and thus, it may be said, the brewer and the beer consumer have not two capitals, but only one capital between them, which, by the act of purchase, the consumer transfers to the brewer; and if, instead of buying beer he buys labour, he simply transfers this capital elsewhere, extinguishing as much demand for labour in one quarter as he creates in another.

The premises of this argument are not denied. To set free a capital, which would otherwise be locked up in a form useless for the support of labour, is, no doubt, the same thing to the interests of labourers as the creation of a new capital. It is perfectly true that if we expend £1,000 in buying beer, we enable the brewer to employ £1,000 in the maintenance of labour, which could not have been so employed while the beer remained unsold, and if it would have remained unsold for ever unless we bought it, then by changing our purpose and hiring spinners instead, we undoubtedly create no new demand for labour: for while we employ £1,000 for hiring labour on the one hand, we annihilate for ever £1,000 of the brewer's capital on the other. But this is confounding the effects arising from the mere suddenness of the change with the effects of the change itself. If, when the buyer ceased to purchase, the capital employed in making beer for his use necessarily perished, then his expending the same amount in hiring spinners would be no creation, but merely a transfer, of

employment. The increased employment which we contend is given to labour would not be given unless the capital of the brewer could be liberated, and would not be given till it was liberated. But everyone knows that the capital invested in an employment can be withdrawn from it, if sufficient time be allowed. If the brewer has previous notice, by not receiving the usual order, he will have produced £1,000 less beer, and an equivalent portion of his capital will have already been set free. If he had no previous notice, and the article consequently remains on his hands, the increase of his stock will induce him next year to suspend or diminish his production until the surplus is carried off. When this process is complete the brewer will find himself as rich as before, with undiminished power of employing labour in general, though a portion of his capital will now be employed in maintaining some other kind of it. Until this adjustment has taken place the demand for labour will be merely changed, not increased; but as soon as it has taken place, the demand for it is increased. Where there was formerly only one capital employed in maintaining men to make £1,000 worth of beer, there is now that same capital employed in making something else, and £1,000 distributed among spinners and weavers besides. There are now two capitals employed in remunerating two sets of labourers; while before, one of those capitals, that of the customer, only served as a wheel in the machinery by which the other capital, that of the brewer, carried on its employment of labour from year to year.

The above illustration, mostly borrowed verbatim from Mr. Mill, is of great length; but its value and conclusiveness, in reference to the subject we have been discussing, justify its adaptation and application to that subject. It has shown us that there are two distinct capitals locked up in the liquor traffic; and considering how enormous the sum of these united capitals must be, is it not probable, remembering the proposition most conclusively proved by Mr. Mill, that 'every increase of capital gives, or is capable of giving, additional employment to industry, and this without assignable limit,' that it could give employment to all the unemployed labour in the country?

In conclusion, we will notice a superficial, but in some eyes plausible, remark that is sometimes heard from people who seem to be devoid of the power of thought. They point to the magnificent fortunes amassed in the liquor trade, and ask, how do the brewers grow rich if their trade is a source of poverty? As parasites grow fat—they feed upon the body they impoverish. Again, they ask—is it conceivable that a

trade, which is the father of those princely fortunes, should be disastrous to the State? We would suggest that, in accordance with the principles enunciated above, these mountains of wealth represent a loss of a far greater magnitude incurred by the nation—mostly by the labouring classes.

---

### BACKWARD GLANCES—ENGLAND IN 1769.

WHEN Sir Walter Scott prefixed to his novel of *Waverley* the secondary title of ‘Sixty Years’ Since,’ he knew that he had been pourtraying a condition of society in the Highlands of Scotland which, in the course of two generations, had nearly melted away. But changes, in many respects as striking, and of incomparably greater importance, have passed over the England which talked and toiled, sorrowed and rejoiced, in 1769. The very ground has been interfered with—cleared, ploughed, canalised, tunnelled, iron-shod—to an almost incredible extent. Macaulay may have exaggerated when he asserted our landscape scenery to have become so altered since the reign of William and Mary, that an Englishman of that period would no longer be able to recognise the land as that with which he was then familiar; yet, although nothing like this transformation of its physical features has befallen the soil of England during the century succeeding the year now under review, enough has taken place to impart a new and more interesting aspect to extensive portions of our insular *terra firma*. England was once a corn-exporting country; now it imports millions of quarters of grain for the use of its people; yet the corn now grown is twice the produce of a century ago. Hundreds of Inclosure Acts have laid open vast spaces to the light and air, the harrow and the husbandman, thus adding to our national stores of food for man and beast. Scientific farming had neither name nor being in 1769, with the exception of the drill-husbandry introduced from Italy by Mr. Jonah Tull, along with the practice of loosening the soil around the growing plant; but Mr. Tull’s disparagement of manure involved his other theories in disrepute, and reduced himself to penury. Mr. Arthur Young was also an experimentalist and critic in high farming, but his personal success was small, and it was after 1769 that his writings imparted a sensible stimulus to an improved system of cultivation. There was not in that year a single society in England having

for its sole object the encouragement of agricultural reform (the Bath and West of England Society for the Encouragement of Agriculture, &c., was founded in 1777); and it could not be expected that the ‘London Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce’ (established 1753) should confer many benefits on English husbandry, though one of its gold medals was awarded in 1769 to Mr. Arthur Young for discoveries in the process of fattening hogs. There is a note of a visit paid by George III. in this year to a Farmer Kennet, of Petersham, in Surrey, who had invented some improved agricultural implements; and as the King really loved farming pursuits, he might have used his patronage to excellent effect had his partiality been united to public zeal and largeness of thought. It cannot be averred that the middle of the eighteenth century was lacking in inventive and enterprising activity; yet little more had then been done beyond taking the first feeble steps in that march of scientific conquest whose trophies are as splendid as they are profuse. The Society of Arts gave, in 1769, a gold medal to Mr. R. L. Edgeworth (Miss Maria Edgeworth’s father) for various mechanical contrivances; and, besides the names of Pringle, Franklin, Priestley, Banks, Home, &c., there are others of greater celebrity which pertain to this period, but whose owners had not yet made the world and posterity their grateful debtors. James Watt was living, and his improved steam engine was patented in the January of 1769, but years had to pass before it was constructed and superseded Newcomen’s defective apparatus. Arkwright had not yet put the spinning machine into working order, nor had Hargreaves brought his spinning-jenny into play. The author of the first geological map of Great Britain (W. Smith, LL.D.) was in his cradle; Dr. Hales had recently died; Cavendish and Black were prosecuting their researches, but Wollaston and Dalton were children, toddling about; and Sir Humphrey Davy was not born till nine years later. In 1769 the two Hunters, John and William, were in the vigour of their days, though they had not attained the zenith of their fame in surgery and medicine. Adam Smith had published his ‘Wealth of Nations’ some years before, but generations had to come and go before his audience had become sufficiently wide and influential to give to the principles of political economy he had enunciated their merited recognition and application. Newton, whose genius made astronomy a science, had been dead 41 years; but it was not till 1773 that an astronomical treatise fell into the hands of the elder Herschel, whose discoveries and methods opened up a new

era in the study of the sidereal heavens. Literature did not offer a luxuriant display in 1769. The only work of that date which has retained its place as a classic is Dr. Robertson's 'History of the Emperor Charles V.' Gibbon had written a few pieces, but had not then put his hand to that imperial work in which, with astonishing wealth of learning and grandeur of style, he renders the 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire' an ever-during monument of the historian's powers. The true poets were not numerous—William Whitehead was the Poet Laureate!—and the masters of the lyre were generally idle. Young and Churchill were lately dead; Goldsmith was writing his 'Deserted Village'; Johnson had abandoned the Muse; and Gray restricted his poetic efforts to an Ode at the installation of the Duke of Grafton, as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. David Garrick composed a still longer Ode on the Shakespeare Jubilee, celebrated at Stratford-on-Avon in the September of the year, the proceedings at which were damped by bad weather, and mercilessly ridiculed by the wits about Town. As good as either for the object, was an Ode by Dr. (Benjamin) Franklin, on the 'Triumphs of the Arts,' written in honour of the inauguration, on the first day of the year, of the Royal Academy, whose first president, Sir Joshua Reynolds, had been knighted in 1768 as a mark of the Royal appreciation of the fine arts. That there was at this period, in the higher circles, a growing love of the beautiful in art, and a sincere desire to promote its development, may be frankly conceded. It is indisputable that in every branch of the fine arts (except that department of painting in which Hogarth, then deceased, reigns unrivalled) the hundred years that have followed 1769 have witnessed an excellence of execution on the part of students, and an earnestness of admiration on the part of the public, to which the England of preceding centuries was a stranger. Poetry will form no exception to this proposition, if a few names—the very highest—are withdrawn from the comparison. There remains this to be said of the manners of the times, that in the most refined classes there was a mixture of politeness and coarseness seldom now encountered. Mr. Dowdeswell, M.P. for Worcestershire (a Dowdeswell still sits for West Worcestershire), said in Parliament—' You have turned out one for impiety and obscenity. What half dozen members of this House ever meet over a convivial bottle that their discourse is entirely free from obscenity, from impiety, or abuse of Government? Even in the Cabinet, that pious reforming society, were the innocent man to throw the first stone, they would slink out one by one, and leave the culprit

uncondemned.' The tastes of the populace were not more choice and comely than those of their social superiors. Hard drinking, with all its evils, was prevalent among men of high and low degree, though it is questionable whether women of good character used intoxicating liquors so freely as many in even this age of Temperance reform are confidently stated to be doing. One form of vice, now prohibited by law, was then officially encouraged—the lottery system. It was customary for the Government to set up a lottery of its own, for the sake of the difference of a few hundred thousand pounds sterling it could thus carry off as gain. In his Budget speech, April 10th, 1769, Lord North, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, said—'A lottery being a tax on the willing only, though many might object to it as an encouragement of gaming, yet he thought the public would be right to avail themselves of the folly of mankind, especially as it laid no burthen on the poor; that lotteries were of various natures, and the more they were varied the more desirous the public were of running into them. He thought it good policy not to overstretch them, as that would be destroying the hen for her eggs;' so he proposed to make a profit of only £180,000, by issuing lottery tickets of the value of £600,000, at a price which would ensure the receipt of £780,000.

Brutal sports and brutal language, not yet expelled from our midst, then abounded to a horrible degree. Education, in a national sense, was not aspired after; scarcely conceived of. Primary instruction was left to 'dame' teachers and private schoolmasters; the Grammar Schools touched a scantling of the population; and the richer classes had resort to private tutors and the Universities. There were no National Schools, no British Schools, no Sunday Schools;—facts which have to be slowly pondered before our minds can comprehend what an abyss of ignorance was before millions of English children in the following century, had not a good Providence and good angels, in the shape of philanthropic men, risen up as the children's friends. It is difficult to estimate to what extent religion, in a vital and practical sense, operated in the society of that period. Where the heads of families were really pious, it is probable that more attention was given, than is now the rule, to the religious instruction and training of children and servants; but such a regard for Christian privileges and obligations was too seldom seen. Bishop Butler had been led thirty years before to compose his celebrated 'Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion,' by perceiving the extent to which scepticism had spread through the educated classes; and in a majority of both

Established and Dissenting churches an icy formalism ruled the pulpit and the pew. Wesley, Whitfield, and their disciples—in a word, modern Methodism—sprang up to protest against both scepticism and formalism, and to bring the God of the Bible very near to the souls of men. Writers not in the least tinged with Methodistic ardour have confessed the great blessings that were thus showered upon the English people; and we may undoubtedly refer to this religious enthusiasm, and its remarkable effects on individual character, much of the new life and zeal which began to distinguish a profession of Christianity throughout the kingdom. In 1769 this movement was in progress, meeting in some quarters with much opposition; and we have our suspicions that to some other reason than a love of social order must be referred the conduct of the Mayor of Gloucester in that year, who caused a Methodist preacher to be whipped out of that city on the alleged ground of his violent ranting. Popular ignorance, debauchery, and impiety could not but bring forth a crop of crimes. The towns swarmed with ruffians, and the waysides were haunted with footpads. Police arrangements were miserably neglected. Before a select committee of the House of Commons Sir John Fielding, the Bow-street magistrate, stated as to Westminster that ‘the watch is insufficient, their duty too hard, and pay too small; that he has known sergeants in the Guards employed as watchmen; that the watchmen are paid 8½d. per night in St. Margaret’s parish, and a gratuity of two guineas a year, out of which they find their own candles; that as they are paid monthly, they borrow their money of a usurer once a week; that commissioners of the respective parishes appoint the beats of their watchmen, without conferring together, which leaves the frontiers of each parish in a confused state; for that, where one side of a street lies in one parish and the other side in another parish, the watchman of one side cannot lend any assistance to persons on the other side, other than as a private person, except in cases of felony.’ Sir John traced much of the crime complained of to ‘irregular taverns,’ where wine was sold under a licence supplied by the Stamp-Office commissioners without a magistrates’ certificate. He said, ‘the magistrates of Middlesex and Westminster have long held it to be a rule essential to the public good rather to diminish than to increase the number of public-houses.’ Mr. Rainsforth, high constable of Westminster, ascribed many of the robberies to the neglect of the watchmen, adding, ‘I have frequently found seven or eight watchmen together in an alehouse.’ In the City of London between five and six hundred cases were tried annually at the

Old Bailey, and undetected offences of every description were rife. ‘Tyburn tree’ (in 1769 a gallows of new and stronger construction was put up) was ever and anon hung with human subjects. Four or five were sometimes executed at one time; and the circumstance that reprieves were frequently issued in the proportion of four to one of executions, for similar crimes, added to the zest with which transgressions of the law were planned and carried out. In the course of 1769 three men were consigned to Tyburn, who had been convicted of taking part in a series of turbulent outbreaks in Spitalfields, for the purpose of cutting out work from looms of masters and workmen who refused to comply with their terms. The civil power being quite unable to cope with these riots, called in the soldiery. Nor was this resort to military aid unusual. A disturbance in Drury Lane could not be quelled until a detachment of the Guards had arrived from the Savoy Barracks. Beggars and vagrants were a prolific race; but the poor-rates, which averaged about a million and a-half per annum, cannot be pronounced excessive, judging by our present standard, though then, as now, it was to drinking and vice that the major portion of the pauperism was really due. So far as paucity of population may be considered to favour the absence of pauperism and other social ills, the England of 1769 had a great advantage over the England of 1869. The inhabitants of England and Wales were then about seven millions—one-third of the present number. London and its suburbs probably included 750,000 souls, but there was not another city or borough in the British Isles which could claim 100,000 inhabitants. Bristol, then the second city of England for wealth, population, and commerce, approached that number, and Edinburgh followed next. No other city or borough contained 50,000 persons. Manchester and Salford united had about 35,000; Liverpool a much smaller number. Birmingham, noted for its smiths in the sixteenth century, had slowly increased in population and industrial power. The total cotton trade of this period is estimated to have fallen short of £250,000 annual value, and the exports of the great and ancient woollen manufacture were valued at under eight millions sterling a year. The commerce of the whole kingdom was a mere fraction of what it has since become. No electric wire spanned the land; no steamship stirred the sea. Internal communication was greatly limited by the state of the roads and the scarcity of conveyances. In winter the highways could not be depended upon; and the cross-roads were little else than quagmires. Mr. McAdam had not then arisen to give his name to a species of roadmaking

which enables carriages to roll easily along in every weather. Not a railway had put its iron mark upon the soil; and the only canal open in 1769 (begun 1755, finished 1768) was one from St. Helens to Sandy Brook, a distance of twelve miles. The Duke of Bridgewater's canal of thirty-eight and a-half miles was then under construction—commenced 1737, finished 1776. The packman and the carrier were the only conveyors of merchandise, and very slowly did they travel. Even the post was tardy in its movement. It was not till 1784 that Mr. Palmer's plans for expediting the transit of the mail bags were adopted by the reluctant officials, and until then a letter posted in London on the Monday afternoon did not arrive till Wednesday morning or later at Bath, a distance of one hundred and ten miles. Just before 1769 the privilege of franking letters had been restricted owing to great abuses, and the scale of charges being but one penny for a distance under fifteen miles, and twopence between fifteen and thirty miles, was an advantage that was afterwards lost till the Penny Postage reform of January 10th, 1840. In the year ending April 5th, 1769, the gross receipts of the Post-Office were (for Great Britain) £305,058, and the charges of management £140,298. The gross receipts were £4,630,000 in the year ending March 31st, 1868.

A hundred years have seen not only a wonderful growth in the great towns, but an equal improvement in the conditions of public comfort and health. The antiquated style of building in populous places was so cramped and crowded, as to be inimical to freedom of traffic, and to a liberal supply of light and fresh air. The street and building improvements that have occurred within living memory indicate what must have been the confined and contracted appearance of the towns a century back. Nine-tenths of the changes which are now executed at great expense and toil are simply the undoing of what, in this respect, our ancestors did amiss. Paving and drainage were also in a wretched state. It was thought a great thing for the City of London to have spent £120,000 in several years on re-paving and new paving. The very centre of the city was engirdled by a nest of narrow streets. All the three bridges then in use (Blackfriars was not finished till the end of 1769) have been removed and replaced, and many others have been thrown across the Thames. Sanitary arrangements all over the kingdom were not worthy of a civilised community. The cesspool system, or worse, was universal. That which would have fructified the earth was allowed to taint the air. The rate of mortality (still unnaturally high) was half as high again as it now is. In London, in 1769, the christenings

were 16,714, the burials 21,847—(in Paris for the same year the births were 19,445, and the deaths 18,427)—and it was not till after nearly thirty years that the births gained upon the deaths. With an increased population such as England now bears, similar insanitary conditions would cause an annual havoc appalling to imagine. And if the general population suffered from conditions so insalubrious, what was the state of the prisoners? Humanity shudders in replying. The gaols of England were golgothas. It is sufficient to say that Howard had not then begun those inquiries which have left his name on the foremost page of his country's benefactors. The Periodical Press of that time, as compared with the same literary power in our day, can only be likened to a petty stream in comparison with the Father of Waters. The *Monthly Review*, *Critical Review*, and *Gentleman's Magazine* were the chief monthlies. The lighter but more polished effusions, on the *Taller* and *Spectator* model, issued several times a week, had either ceased to appear, or had lost nearly all their better features. The daily newspaper press was represented by the *London Daily Post*, the *London Evening Post*, and the *Public Advertiser*, which were small in size, dear in price, and limited in circulation. A sale of 2,000 copies was the maximum of a daily paper. Not one of the great daily organs of opinion and intelligence now published had then appeared. The *Morning Chronicle* (now extinct) was started towards the latter end of 1769; but ten years afterwards, the 'getting-up' of a daily newspaper was such as would now be felt simply intolerable. Parliamentary reporting, which in 1769 was hardly known in the case of the daily papers, had advanced so far in 1779, that summaries were furnished the next day, but extended debates had to be served up in successive issues. The *London Chronicle*, in 1769, was published three times a week, and consisted of eight pages quarto, and, as appears from a volume now before us, the advertisements were mixed up with the other matter, no editorial articles occupied a distinctive place, and the paper used for printing was of coarse texture. Yet the *London Chronicle* had not a superior, perhaps not a rival, in the class it represented. All the English newspapers of that period are estimated to have had a collective sale of twelve million copies per annum; a number which falls short by one-half of the yearly circulation now enjoyed by more than one London daily journal. From 1769, however, may be dated the more conspicuous exhibition of that political influence which the newspaper now exerts through its leading articles; only, that instead of 'leaders' of the modern stamp, the political writing was then executed by

contributors who assumed such designations as best suited their topics or their tastes. The most distinguished of these was the anonymous writer who adopted the *nom de plume* of 'Junius,' and whose letters in the *Public Advertiser*, commencing in the January of 1769, and appearing at intervals till 1772, have retained much of their original celebrity. Their loftiness of aim ill-contrasted with the scurrility and venom which too frequently disfigured them; but 'Junius' had at command an amount of secret information, a brilliancy of style, and a keenness of invective, which drew upon him the public eye as by a resistless fascination. He gleamed as a meteor in the political heavens, scattering not a little of the terror with which the sight of a bearded comet distracted the votaries of superstition. The excitement produced by the feats of this literary swordsman culminated for a time, when, on the 19th of December, 1769, he charged down upon the King himself, whom he treated with a boldness that made the monarch wince, the courtiers curse, and the people shout. The identity of 'Junius' with one or other of the notabilities of that age has been frequently discussed; but even the most plausible hypothesis, supported by Lord Macaulay and a host of critics, has lost ground of late; and Sir Philip Francis is no longer so confidently regarded as the viziered knight who aroused the admiration and baffled the curiosity of contemporary observers.

The political situation cannot be described without a reference to the Sovereign, King George III. On the 1st of January, 1769, he had worn the crown a little over eight years (since October, 1760), and was still in the vigour of his early manhood; but at thirty-two King George possessed and displayed all those characteristics which have made him one of the best known of English monarchs. He was the first of his family who had been born and trained in England, but he had unfortunately been brought up by his mother in the resolution to be 'every inch a king'—that is, to govern as well as reign. Yet for governing wisely, either as an absolute or constitutional ruler, he was altogether unfitted. He was conscientious, chaste, frank, affectionate, and faithful—qualities that might have rendered him beloved and useful in a private station; but he was also narrow-minded, prone to prejudice, self-opinionated to a fault, and vindictively disposed towards those who opposed his wishes—peculiarities which made him one of the most pernicious of kings. The Whigs had set and kept his dynasty on the throne; yet because the traditions of Whiggism did not admit of his personal control over affairs of State, he did his utmost to exclude the Whigs from place and

power. He was in a measure successful, but from the first he was doomed to struggle against principles more powerful than any force of will and royalty he could array against them. He set the American colonies on fire, by asserting in the most offensive shape his own ideas of the imperial prerogative; and in the year 1769 he was the scarcely-veiled champion of a policy, which, if carried logically out, would have made the House of Commons the altar and sepulchre of the Representative system. Strange to say, the man over whom a great Constitutional battle was to be fought was utterly unworthy of the honour. John Wilkes was ugly in face, impure in life, and selfish in soul; but he was plausible and insinuating—even so sturdy a Tory as Dr. Johnson could not resist his social blandishments;—and he became the idol of the people as the object of attacks which imperilled their dearest liberties and rights. The year 1769 was, politically-speaking, a crisis-epoch. The Government had at its head the Duke of Grafton, more distinguished by his rank than for ability or virtue; and the really presiding minister was Lord North, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who pleased the King and ‘led’ the Commons. There were two Secretaries of State—Lord Weymouth and the Earl of Rochford, with Earl Hillsborough as a third Secretary for the Colonies. Lord Camden was the Lord Chancellor. These were the principal members of the Administration; but so incohesive were its elements, that Lord Camden in a debate, in the session of 1770, strongly concurred in the denunciations of the Earl of Chatham against the policy pursued by the ministry in the House of Commons in regard to the Middlesex election. It is true he was soon after compelled to resign; but that so honourable and noble a man as Lord Camden felt at liberty, while holding the Great Seal, to differ from and vote against the course strenuously upheld by his official colleagues, is a proof that executive unity and solidarity were then much less insisted upon than they are now. The Duke of Grafton’s ministry, indeed, was almost daily expected to go to pieces, for it was a composite and ill-jointed body. When formed it had received the apparent support of the great Earl of Chatham, who, for a time, held the office of Lord Privy Seal; but in 1768-9 he had sunk into a state of political torpor (the causes of which have never been perfectly cleared up); and from this inactivity he did not emerge till after the House of Commons—the scene of his senatorial glory as William Pitt—had scandalously invaded that freedom of election whose surrender he foresaw would leave to English liberty nothing but the name. And the Parliament so acting

was a new one; for in 1768, as in 1868, there was a general election—not, however, in November (as in 1868), but in March. Bribery and corruption, at the earlier date, were powerful auxiliaries in the contest; they were far from discarded in the recent one; and it is a curious coincidence that as a Justice Willes, in 1769, presided at a trial for alleged bribery in Cornwall, so, in 1869, another Justice Willes has been trying election petitions charging similar misconduct on candidates and their agents.\* The Parliament elected in the March of 1768 did not meet till November 8th, and re-assembled, after the Christmas holidays, on January 25th, 1769. Mr. Wilkes, who had been expelled from the late Parliament and outlawed, returned from France previous to the general election, and was elected one of the members for Middlesex, after having failed as a candidate for the City of London. His old popularity then revived, and he addressed very large assemblies, one of which, in St. George's Fields, May, 1768, was fired upon by the military with fatal effect to several persons. Great agitation ensued, which Wilkes, a thorough demagogue, did his best to inflame by printing a letter, until then unknown to the public, addressed by Lord Weymouth, the Secretary of State, to the chairman of the Lambeth magistrates—Wilkes himself prefacing this letter by violent remarks, in which he charged the Secretary with having planned the ‘massacre’ in St. George’s Fields. When Parliament re-assembled, Lord Weymouth indignantly complained of the libel, and after a conference by delegates between the two Houses, a resolution was carried in the Commons, February 3rd, by 219 votes to 137, denouncing Wilkes’s charge as a libel, and expelling him on account of it. The freeholders of Middlesex re-elected him February 16th; and next day the House by 235 votes to 89 declared the election void, and Wilkes incapable of being elected to serve in that Parliament. A new writ was issued, but so intense was the feeling on Wilkes’s behalf that no one was found bold enough to propose the only other candidate, a Mr. Dingley, and Wilkes was re-elected without opposition on the 13th of March. The Commons again pronounced the election void, and ordered a new one—an opponent to Wilkes coming forward in the person of Colonel Lutterell, a member, who resigned his seat

\* The Justice Willes of 1769, when trying a charge preferred against a Cornish mayor of buying eighteen votes, declared that bribery had reached a pitch which threatened the utter ruin of the nation, and he avowed his wish to award the complainant, if possible, the full penalty of £3,000. The jury assessed the damages at £1,000. The judge, we are told, ‘gained much honour and praise in the county by his behaviour on this occasion.’

in order to contest the county of Middlesex. Two other candidates appeared, and at the close of the poll, April 13th, the votes stood—Wilkes 1,143, Lutterell 296, Whitaker 5, Roach 0. On April 15th, the House decided by 197 votes to 143 that Colonel Lutterell ought to have been elected, and next day it decided, by 221 votes to 139, that Colonel Lutterell had been duly elected, and was entitled to sit and vote, which he did. The freeholders of Middlesex challenged this decision, and were heard by counsel at the bar of the House, but on May 8th, by a vote of 221 against 152, the previous resolutions were confirmed. In resisting these proceedings, great energy and eloquence were employed by both wings of the Opposition—the party attached to Mr. George Grenville, and the party which adhered to the Marquis of Rockingham, whose chief spokesman in the Commons was Mr. Edmund Burke; but the Ministerialists outvoted the unanswerable orators, and Wilkes remained excluded. At the general election of 1774 he was again returned for Middlesex, and permitted to sit, but it was not till after repeated failures, and another general election, that he was able, on the 3rd of May, 1782, to persuade the House, by a vote of 115 to 47, to expunge from its Journals the record of his expulsions in 1769, accompanied by a solemn declaration of the unconstitutionality of the conduct then pursued. So was concluded a controversy that should never have been opened, and concluded in the only way consistent with the liberties of the nation.

On American colonial affairs the Parliament and Government of 1769 were equally perverse and pertinacious. They upheld the policy of the last Parliament, which had imposed revenue duties collected at the colonial ports. These dues had brought in a paltry £20,000 a year, but the levy of them revived the animosities laid to rest by the repeal of the Stamp Act. Both Houses of Parliament, in 1769, passed, by large majorities, and embodied in addresses to the King, resolutions condemning the agitation which had broken out in Massachusetts and was extending to the other colonies. This procedure may be said to have determined all the subsequent dissensions and disasters, with the eventual separation of the colonies from the mother country, because it encouraged the King in his arbitrary purposes, and put an impassable bar in the way of measures of conciliation, until conciliation was too late to be effectual. After a century's experience we have improved, in this respect, upon the colonial statesmanship of 1769. Parliament was prorogued, by a speech from the Throne, on May 10th; but the irretrievable mischief was done. It was the minority, not the

majority, which reflected the political liberality and intelligence of the times. Nor was this extraordinary. The growing middle-class was very imperfectly represented, and the populace was coarse and brutal. Except in a few places, such as the City of London, Westminster, and Preston, where the local franchise was comprehensive, the borough representation was in the hands and pockets of titled or wealthy proprietors. Public spirit, with a few exceptions, had taken refuge in the counties where the freeholders were independent, and could afford to despise the frowns of a self-willed Sovereign, and a subservient House of Lords. County meetings were held by the freeholders of York, Surrey, Bucks (a Hampden presiding), Essex, Gloucester, and other shires, unanimously denouncing the conduct of Government and Parliament in regard to the Middlesex election, and 7,000 citizens of Westminster met in Westminster Hall with a similar object. The liverymen of the City of London were foremost in the struggle, and Alderman Beckford, though old and worn out, as he said, was elected by them a second time Lord Mayor, as a special mark of their displeasure against the Administration and the Court. Open turbulence was not wanting. A deputation from some of the Government's friends was assaulted on its way to St. James's Palace, and the Lord Chamberlain broke his staff of office in resisting the entrance of the mob. A number of rioters were captured, most of whom were soon let go, and when the five worst were sent for trial the grand jury threw out all the bills of indictment against them. Another and severer mortification the Government experienced on the 10th of November, when a suit of Wilkes against the Earl of Halifax, late Secretary of State, was determined. Wilkes claimed £20,000 damages from the Earl for having issued a warrant under which his desks were broken into, and his papers abstracted in 1765. At a previous trial, when the Under-Secretary was defendant, the system of general warrants was condemned as illegal by the Court of Common Pleas, and on the later occasion a verdict for £4,000 damages was returned, which, it was said, would have been much larger had not a Treasury minute come to light which provided that all expenses arising from this suit should be defrayed out of the Exchequer. The Irish policy of the Government had also caused much discontent in the sister country. In the Parliament (composed entirely of Protestants) one debate had grown so warm that swords were drawn; an important Government bill was thrown out by the Irish Commons; and when Sir George Macartenev, son-in-law of Lord Bute, and Secretary of State for Ireland, informed the

members that ‘Ireland was a dependent government, and owed to England the highest obligations and the free exercise of its invaluable privileges,’ we are told that ‘the whole House became turbulent, and it was with difficulty the Speaker could bring it to order.’ Foreign affairs, too, though outwardly smooth, did not please the critics of the Government, who alleged that its supineness had enabled the French to overrun and subdue Corsica. General Paoli, the Corsican patriot, was received with triumph by the people, who would willingly have fought for his cause against the French. Speculation, indeed, may well brighten at the thought of what might have been the effect of sending a British fleet to Corsica, with military aid to the gallant islanders. Then, perhaps, Napoleon Buonaparte, born on the 15th of August, 1769, would never have been a French subject, nor have entered the French service, nor have crossed swords at Waterloo with the Duke of Wellington, also born that year. In one respect the Government of 1769 might seem entitled to more commendation than their successors. The supplies voted by Parliament that year were £6,909,003; in this present year of grace the expenses of our Government will be ten times as great. But when we take into account that Ireland is now upon our list, that the population of Great Britain is thrice as great, and that more than two-fifths of our annual revenue is absorbed by interest on debts contracted before 1816, we are not disposed so hastily to assign the palm of economy to the Government of 1769. Taxation in some points is not so heavy. The ‘Annual Register’ of that year quotes from ‘a humourous foreigner’ the following remark:—‘In England, the people are taxed in the morning for the soap which washes their hands; at nine, for the coffee, the tea, and the sugar they use for their breakfast; at noon, for the starch which powders their hair; at dinner, for the salt which savours their meat; in the evening, for the porter which cheers their spirits; all day long, for the light which enters their windows; and at night, for the candles that light them to bed.’ No ‘humourous foreigner’ can now say all this concerning the taxation to which Britons are subject. From one burden of guilt we are certainly free—that of contributing to the support and extension of the slave trade. In 1768 there had been exported from the Western coast of Africa 144,000 negro slaves, of whom 59,440 were bought by British subjects at an average price of £15. 9s. We can thank God that that abomination is no longer to be laid to our charge. The times have changed when we have to record that Sir Samuel Baker has now entered the service of the Viceroy of Egypt that he

may help to suppress the slave trade on the districts of the Upper Nile.

Among the obituary notices of 1769 there are none of much historical interest. In that year there died the Duke of Dorset, a patron of letters, and, at an old age, David Barclay, grandson of Robert Barclay, the author of the ‘Apology’ for Quakerism ; and it is added that David Barclay had enjoyed the singular distinction of receiving at his house in Cheapside three English kings when visiting the City. A number of centenarians died in that year, if the entries are correct, which the late Sir George Cornwall Lewis would have denied severally and altogether ; but a brief account is given of a man said to have been then living in Aberdeenshire aged one hundred and twenty-one, ‘of the middle size, and of a ruddy complexion.’ His age was certified by an entry in an old Bible. Had a young man, celebrating his majority in 1769, been endowed with a longevity equal to that of this Scottish peasant, he would still be living to testify, from personal knowledge, of those differences and events which we have described in outline, and of a rate of national progress immeasurably greater in the last century than in any that preceded. It is hardly likely that the next century will be so fruitful in discoveries and appliances having to do with material processes and results ; but in regard to moral and social reforms, there is ample room for all that wit can devise, that heart can yearn after, and that will can effect. ‘*Meliora*’ is the watchword of all sincere patriots :—the prophecy of all patriotic bards. The Golden Age is perpetually before us—never attained, but ever sending us scintillations of the brightness beyond. The Happy Isles give us glimpses of their shining shores, their purple hills, and their valleys of emerald green ; and to quicken our pursuit they send us breezes rich with the odours of their spicy groves. This supreme excellence, this absolute felicity, is not all a dream born of fancy and the soul. ‘In all labour there is profit ;’ we reap what we sow and while we sow ; and if our national efforts after health, sobriety, prosperity, intelligence, virtue, and everlasting goodness are proportioned to the advantages possessed, the ‘England yet to be’ will become the heir of a dowry the most glorious in the memory of Time.

---

## SOMERSETSHIRE.

SOMERSET, 'the pleasant land,' as its name signifies, is a kind of isthmus, connecting the ancient Danmonium with the rest of England. Twelve hundred and fifty years ago the Celts were endeavouring to hold their ground against the Saxons in the sea-bounded, mountain-traversed region we now call Devon and Cornwall. They were gradually driven farther and farther back, until the whole country became subject to Saxon rule. Long before that time, long before Saxon aid was sought so disastrously against the Picts, Somersetshire had become famous in English history. Probably there is no other county, except metropolitan Middlesex itself, which has played so important a part in the annals of this country. Just as its geology presents almost every stratification, so its archaeology presents almost every epoch. There is the Druidical temple of Stanton Drew; there is the Belgic city on the high land above Bath; there is the Roman camp of Cadbury; and there is every kind of Gothic building, from the Norman abbey at Glastonbury to the richly-decorated 'perpendicular' towers of Wrington, and all those other beautiful churches which Henry VII. built out of gratitude to the men of Somersetshire for their faithful adherence to the House of Lancaster. It was in Somersetshire, according to the (not very trustworthy) tradition, that Joseph of Arimathæa landed with his companion, Simon Zelotes. The two Apostles, it is said, disembarked in Bridgwater Bay, and coming to Weary-all-Hill, which overlooks the modern Glastonbury, St. Joseph planted his staff there in token that he would rest from his wanderings. Both Apostle and staff took kindly to the soil. The first brought forth fruit in the shape of a converted people. The second brought forth flowers as miraculous as those which budded from Aaron's rod fifteen hundred years before. There some five hundred years later in the island valley of Avalon lay King Arthur, wounded to death, in the victory over his rebel nephew, Modred, at Launcelot; and thence his body was carried to the Abbey of Glastonbury for sepulture. Only a few miles from that place a king as noble as Arthur lay hid in Æthelingay—the Isle of Nobles, which he fortified and whence he sallied forth, now in the disguise of a harper to learn the plans of his enemies, and now at the head of his faithful followers to surprise and overwhelm them. The modern Athelney is the scene of King Alfred's retreat. It was there that

the King got chidden by the wife of the neatherd for spoiling her cakes ;—the neatherd whom Alfred, remembering his hospitality and forgetting the chiding, persuaded to forsake his flocks for books, and to such good purpose as to become Bishop of Winchester. Seven hundred years later another king dealt very differently with another ecclesiastic. Scarcely one of the religious houses in England was more celebrated than the Abbey of Glastonbury. St. Patrick and St. Benedict had ruled it as abbots, St. Dunstan had wrestled there with the Evil One in bodily form. Its fame increased from century to century, and with its fame its wealth. In the 16th century the Abbot's household amounted to 300 persons, and 500 strangers were often entertained within its walls. They were eating and drinking, and knew not that the flood was upon them which was to sweep them away. It was a most destructive deluge. Not Glastonbury only, but five other abbeys, fifteen priories, three nunneries, one preceptory of knights hospitallers, three colleges, six hospitals, and many minor houses went down in Somersetshire alone. But Glastonbury was the crown of them all. It was a royal morsel worthy of the omnivorous appetite of Henry. For that reason, because it was a possession well worth defending, Abbot Whiting refused to surrender it at the King's command. He learnt very speedily that that command was not to be trifled with. He was torn from his monastery, dragged on a hurdle up to the Tor Hill, and was there hanged and quartered ; his head was afterwards set up over his own abbey gate, and his limbs were distributed to Bath, Wells, Ilchester, and Bridgwater. The royal spoiler had many imitators. The King had seized the abbey lands, the nobles would seize the common lands. Bitter were the complaints of the commoners, and in 1549 Edward VI., by the advice of his uncle the Duke of Somerset, issued an order to restrain the nobles and the gentry from enclosing commons and converting them into pastures and parks, for their own use, to the great injury of the poor cottagers who depastured cows and geese thereon. The young king ordered all such enclosures to be thrown down, under heavy penalties. This order produced little effect. The robbers of the poor continued to remove their neighbours' landmarks until the people rose tumultuously and broke down the fences. The royal troops were then sent against the people, and the very men who had wronged them were entrusted with the task of reducing them to obedience. In what way one of these, Lord Stourton, did this is told at great length in Phelps's 'History and Antiquities of Somersetshire ;' suffice it to say here that Lord Stourton was

guilty of the foulest treachery and murder, and was justly hanged at Westminster, with a silken rope. A little later followed the Sabbatarian controversy, which, beginning in an attempt to put down wakes on the Sunday, led to the promulgation of the royal decree, ordering the day to be celebrated with sports.

During the civil war Somersetshire was the scene of several important engagements. After the success of the Royalists at Stratton, in Cornwall, May 16, 1643, the victors, reinforced by a body of cavalry and by the Marquis of Hertford and Prince Maurice, overran the whole of Devonshire, and then a great part of Somersetshire. Sir William Waller was sent to restore the authority of the Parliament. A severe engagement was fought on Lansdowne Hill, about four miles to the north of Bath. But though the Royalist General, Sir Beville Grenville, was killed, neither party gained a decisive advantage. Eight days later Waller was severely defeated near Devizes. This event was quickly followed by the capture of Bristol, under Prince Rupert, after a desperate resistance, in which the assailants lost 500 men. Before long, fortune changed. The defeat at Naseby was succeeded by a long series of Royalist disasters. Fairfax was sent into Somersetshire, to raise the siege of Taunton, then invested by Colonel Goring. This object was accomplished, and Fairfax also took Bridgewater, with a thousand officers, gentlemen, and clergy, and 1,500 soldiers. For this victory he returned thanks at Martock Church on the following Sunday. Next he took Sherborne and Nunney castles, and then advanced against Bristol. He spent ten days in preparing for an assault, but before making it besought Prince Rupert to spare a useless effusion of blood by surrender. The Prince desired time to communicate with the King, but Fairfax would admit of no delay, and the assault was commenced. The Prince then surrendered (Sept. 11, 1645), on condition that he and the garrison should go out with the honours of war. The news of the capitulation filled the King with dismay, for his uncle had assured him that he would hold out for four months. This abortive defence was only less disastrous than the defeat at Naseby. Four days later Farley Castle, some six miles from Bath, likewise surrendered, and the whole of Somersetshire was then subdued to the authority of the Parliament. Devonshire was next reduced, and the war in the west terminated with the fall of Exeter, April 9, 1646. Somersetshire contributed one of the most brilliant and able commanders to the Commonwealth that England had ever

seen. William Blake, who raised England's naval fame to its highest point, was born at Bridgwater in 1599.

Unhappily for Somersetshire, it became the scene of a very memorable tragedy forty years after the victories of Fairfax. The Western country was strongly Protestant. William of Orange was to experience this when he landed at Torbay in 1688. Three years before that, an ill-fated Prince was to make trial of Somersetshire Protestantism. The Duke of Monmouth, illegitimate son of Charles II., landed at Lyme Regis, Dorsetshire, June 11, 1685. He had but a hundred men with him, yet so popular were both he and the cause which he represented, that in four days this number increased twenty-fold. At Taunton he was received with enthusiasm; and twenty girls of high social position presented him with colours and a Bible. Bridgwater, Wells, and Frome declared for him; but after hearing of the defeat of the Duke of Argyll in Scotland, he thought it prudent to retreat to the first of those three towns. Thence he advanced suddenly against the Royal troops, under Lord Feversham, at Sedge-moor. At first he threw confusion into their ranks, but being unsupported by cavalry, Monmouth's force was, after three hours of desperate fighting, utterly routed, and their leader was a few days later captured in the disguise of a peasant. When discovered he was found lying in a ditch, and so broken down by fatigue, privation, and fear, that on being taken he burst into tears. His death was followed by the infamous bloody assize, which was a theme of horror in many a Somersetshire household for long years afterwards. In the autumn Judge Jeffreys, attended by a troop of Col. Kirke's regiment, called, in bitter irony, 'Kirke's lambs,' opened the assize. Jeffreys visited Winchester, Dorchester, Exeter, Taunton, Bridgwater, and Bristol. At every place his progress was marked by blood. But it was chiefly in the Somersetshire towns that he gave full licence to his lust of carnage. Macaulay has described the ghastly horrors of that memorable autumn in his own vivid manner, but at far too great a length for quotation. An older writer, Fox, the biographer of James II., has sketched the same fearful scene in a few vigorous words. Speaking of Jeffreys, he says:—

'He made all the West an Aceldama; some places he quite depopulated, and nothing was to be seen in them but forsaken walls, unlucky gibbets and ghostly carcasses. The trees were loaded with quarters, almost as thick as leaves; the houses and steeples were covered as close with heads, as at other times with crows and daws; cauldrons hissing, carcasses boiling, pitch and tar glowing, blood and limbs boiling, and he, Jeffreys, the great director of it all.'

This monster boasted that he had hanged more traitors than all the judges since the Norman conquest. The lowest estimate is 320; the highest 700. The number of prisoners whom he transported was 841. These were more wretched than the others. They were sold into slavery, and had to endure the horrors of the slave ship. Macaulay says:—

‘More than one-fifth of those who were shipped were flung to the sharks before the end of the voyage. The human cargoes were stowed close in the holds of small vessels. So little space was allowed that the wretches, many of whom were still tormented by unhealed wounds, could not all lie down at once without lying on one another. They were never suffered to go on deck. The hatchway was constantly watched by sentinels armed with hangers and blunderbusses. In the dungeon below all was darkness, stench, lamentation, disease, and death.’

In vain did the saintly Ken plead with the brutal monster for mercy. There was but one way of obtaining remission of penalty—by bribes absolutely ruinous to those who paid them. Jeffreys declared afterwards, when his cruelties were brought up against him, that he had acted only in accordance with his master’s instructions. This is possible; but the delight with which the Judge gloated over the misery that he caused was thoroughly spontaneous. Is it not strange that the holy and loving Bishop of Bath and Wells, whose heart bled as he witnessed these ravages among his flock, should have felt himself bound to maintain his allegiance to the man, who as Sovereign, had been responsible for it? But it is not for us to complain that Ken joined the non-jurors. It was while he was living in privacy at Longleat, a pensioner of the Marquis of Bath, that he wrote the ‘Morning and Evening Hymns,’ for which, far more than for his resistance to the Declaration of Indulgence, the Church owes him eternal thanks. There is little more that we need say of the history of Somersetshire. Bristol, which lies partly in that county, partly in Gloucestershire, did itself honour by electing Edmund Burke as M.P., did itself dishonour by the formidable riots and incendiarism that followed the rejection of the first Reform Bill.

Many illustrious men have been born or have lived in this county. We have already mentioned the most famous of them, Blake. His contemporary Prynne was born near Bath, in 1610. Seven years later Cudworth, one of the greatest theologians whom the English Church has ever produced, was born at Aller. Fifteen years later still, a scarcely less famous, and certainly more read, metaphysician, John Locke, was born at Wrington. Laud for two years was Bishop of Bath and Wells; and after him a very different man, whom we have named above, the meek and holy Ken. Henry

Fielding, the novelist, first saw the light at Sharpham Park, Glastonbury, 1707. This last name recalls many others whose owners were intimately connected with the chief city of Somersetshire. Early in the 18th century there came to Bath a young man, Ralph Allen by name, who had only his wit for his fortune. He was so happy as to win the favour of Field Marshal Wade, who gave him his daughter to wife. The Field Marshal did much more than this. He obtained for his son-in-law the farming of the cross posts, and so lucrative was the monopoly that it brought to its lucky holder £20,000 a year. Allen was a shrewd man, and an enterprising one. He thought that it would not be wise for the world to know how large his profits were. So in order both to disguise and to increase them, he opened the free-stone quarries on Combe Down, to the south of Bath. They were to him a veritable Ophir. These and his contract enabled him to build the palace now known as Prior Park. It has been for many years a college for training Roman Catholic clergy. In Allen's time it held inmates of a widely different character. Thither resorted Pope (who wrote in Allen's grounds the 'Essay on Man'), Warburton, Fielding, and many other men of note. The last we have mentioned put his host into a novel, and Allen is now perpetuated in the gallery of British fiction as the Squire Allworthy of 'Tom Jones.' Not far from Prior Park, in the lovely village of Claverton, in whose churchyard Allen is buried, there lived for some years, as rector, Richard Graves, the author of 'The Spiritual Quixote.' Later in the century Garrick was the bright particular star of the Bath theatre. It was in Bath that Wolfe, the conqueror of Quebec, resided before he went to his victorious death. There, too, Herschel made the observations which led to the discovery of a new planet. In that same city dwelt for a time Edmund Burke, and in our own day lived William Beckford, author of 'Vathek,' and Walter Savage Landor, author of the 'Imaginary Conversations,' and at Freshford, six miles from Bath, Sir William Napier wrote his famous history of the Peninsular war. In that city, too, less than a quarter of a century ago, resided occasionally a Frenchman who had rendered himself notorious and ridiculous; while twelve miles off, in a school on the Clifton Downs, was a beautiful girl of Spanish descent, all unconscious of the future—that future which would see the Frenchman Emperor, and herself Empress of France and Queen of Fashion. We must not forget that Somersetshire was for many years the abode of Coleridge, and Southey, and Hannah More. In the fruitful vale of Taunton, the witty Canon of St. Paul's, Sydney

Smith, lived as a country rector. On the shores of the Bristol Channel, where

‘Twice a day the Severn fills,  
The salt sea water passes by  
And hushes half the babbling Wye,  
And makes a murmur in the hills,’

lies he whose memory has been handed down to all time by the finest threnody in the language—Arthur Henry Hallam of the ‘In Memoriam.’

Somersetshire, like its neighbour Gloucestershire, is the seat of a twin bishopric. The union of Bath and Wells is of far older date than that of Gloucester and Bristol, which took place in our own time. In fact, Bath was never the seat of a separate bishopric as Bristol was. The cathedral was always, from the day that King Ina (704) established the ecclesiastical corporation, until now, at Wells. The chief church at Bath belonged not to a capitular but to a monastic body, and was an abbey, not a cathedral. Early in the 12th century, John de Villula was consecrated ‘Bishop of Somerset.’ Before entering holy orders he had practised as a physician at Bath. Subsequently to his consecration, he took advantage of a royal ordinance proclaiming that it would be to the honour and the dignity of the Church if certain sees were removed from small towns to places of greater note, and he obtained the union of the see of Wells with the abbey of Bath, rebuilt the latter structure, and was called Bishop of Bath. Subsequently, on many occasions, there were violent quarrels between the canons of Wells and the monks of Bath both as to who should elect the bishop and what title he should bear. Bishop Robert, the founder of the present Cathedral at Wells, decided that he would take his title from both places, that on a vacancy a certain number of canons and monks should elect the bishop, the Dean of Wells being the returning officer, and that the bishop should be enthroned in both churches. After his death the contention was renewed by the monks of Bath, who claimed the sole right of election. In consequence of these disputes the see remained vacant for many years. We need scarcely say that no such difficulty has occurred since the Reformation. The crown-appointed Bishop of Bath and Wells holds both titles. But the first is an empty one. The abbey at Bath is only a parish church, and its services, so far from being conducted on the Cathedral type, are intensely Puritan.

Somersetshire possesses not only the stately Cathedral at Wells, whose magnificent west front is peopled with more than 150 statues that Flaxman declares must have been brought

from Italy; not only romantic Prior Park, of old the residence of Fielding's 'Squire Allworthy,' now a Roman Catholic college; but also an institution to which public attention has been directed lately by a popular writer, the 'Agapemone,' or 'Abode of Love.' Henry James Prince, the founder of this institution, was born in Bath fifty-eight years ago. He was brought up at first for the medical profession, but eventually entered holy orders. He was from his youth a mystic, and studied the writings of the German, Gerhard Tersteegen. He was appointed to the curacy of Charlinch, a Somersetshire village among the Polden hills. Soon he began a species of revivalism not at all to the liking of old Bishop Law, who put the erratic priest to silence. Prince went to Suffolk for a time, and with like result. Bishop Allen was scandalised no less than his right reverend brother of Bath and Wells had been. Prince then openly seceded, together with some of his most ardent followers. After lifting up his testimony for awhile in worldly Brighton he returned to his native county, and at Spaxton, four miles from Bridgwater, he set up the Abode of Love. He announced himself as the 'Beloved,' and as such he exercised autocratic power among his believers. They entered the Agapemone, and certain of them, notably three young spinsters, contributed to it their substance. Then came scandals. The profane outside the Abode of Love hinted at something more than madness on the part of those who gave up their fortunes to Prince, and at very worldly wisdom on the part of those who profited thereby. There were legal proceedings, Government inquiries, and abundance of gossip. But the institution has survived all these—has survived certain revelations of a delicate character, with which we need not encumber these pages. The Abode of Love still exists. Whether or not it will survive its founder may fairly be questioned.

'Somersetshire,' says Mr. Acland, in his prize essay on the farming of that county, published in the Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society, 'furnishes examples of almost every kind of soil, subsoil, and climate found in England.'

'The geology of Somersetshire includes specimens of nearly all the formations which appear on the surface of England from Wales to Norfolk: the grauwacke in the hills of Exmoor and Quantock; the old red sandstone and mountain limestone in Mendip; the coal measures among the hills near Bath; the new red sandstone and marls in the Vale of Taunton Dean and at the base of many of the hills; the lias which bounds the Bridgwater level like a sea cliff, or rises out of it in patches like islands; the oolite formations extending over the south and east of the county; the green sand and the chalk which appear in the Chard and Crewkerne hills and in the table-land between Somerset and Devon; and, lastly, an

extensive alluvial deposit partly covered by peat and fen land, which fills up the Bridgwater level.'

The following figures will present visibly the social and economical condition of the county:—

	Acres.
Total acreage.....	1,047,220
All kinds of crops—bare, fallow, and pasture .....	735,604
Corn .....	141,577
Green crops .....	70,965
Clover and artificial grasses.....	50,350
Permanent pastures, exclusive of hill pastures.....	458,688
Proportion of corn crops to all kinds of crops, bare and fallow.....	19·2
Proportion of corn crops to all kinds of crops, bare and fallow, for all England .....	33·2
No. of cattle, 173,687, being 23·6 to 100 acres; 15·4 being the average for all England.	
No. of sheep, 636,975, being 86·6 to 100 acres; 68·0 being the average for all England.	

In Somersetshire about one person in eight is engaged in agriculture, or nearly four and a-half times as many as in Lancashire. Nevertheless, Somersetshire is by no means wholly agricultural. It possesses both manufactures and mines. More than 8,000 women and more than 1,100 men are engaged in the manufacture of gloves, which is carried on chiefly at and in the neighbourhood of Yeovil. The woollen cloth manufacture, though less famous than it used to be, still engages about 3,600 persons. Altogether about 17,000 persons, out of a population of less than half a million, belong to the manufacturing class. Considering the reputation acquired by Bath stone, the oolite of which the whole city of Bath is built, it will excite surprise that the number of persons engaged in these and the limestone quarries of Somersetshire is but about 600. The explanation lies in the fact that all the principal Bath stone quarries lie just outside the borders of that county, just inside the borders of Wiltshire. At the eastern end of the Box Tunnel, on the Great Western Railway, is the entrance to the largest stone quarry in the world, whose workings extend for several miles. The tunnel itself is cut through the oolite, and the ground overhead is honey-combed with quarries. It is not until the traveller has crossed a narrow stream, some two miles to the west of this tunnel, that he enters Somersetshire. The piercing of that great mass of oolite, known as Box Hill, was one of Brunel's greatest feats. It was a most costly work, so costly that this and the tunnels through the limestone and the red sandstone between Bath and Bristol, rendered the construction of the twenty-five miles of line between Chippenham and Bristol as expensive as that of the

ninety-five miles between London and Chippenham. The fault, however, was not wholly Brunel's. He would have taken his railway through the proper channel, by the vale of Pewsey, past Marlborough, into the vale of the Avon; but the then living Marquis of Ailesbury interposed, and offered such opposition that the promoters of the line had to bore through Box Hill. This short-sighted selfishness on the part of a great landowner was speedily a cause of regret to him. His own peculiar borough of Marlborough was ruined. Seeing that, he attempted to obtain a line which should restore the fortunes of the place. Having done an irreparable injury to the promoters of the Great Western by turning them aside from their proper route, he endeavoured to do them a further injury by constructing a competing line through the very district which he had closed against them. The attempt succeeded, and must be reckoned as one of the causes why this magnificent railway pays no dividend to its unfortunate shareholders. It is pleasant to contrast with this conduct that of another nobleman. Lord Taunton not only offered no opposition to the construction of the Bristol and Exeter railway through his property, but finding, after a time, that the railway had increased the value of that property, he returned to the company a very large sum which had been paid him for compensation.

As Bath stone for the most part comes not from Bath, so neither do Bath bricks. These are made near Bridgwater, in a district which, though only about a mile in extent, is the only place in the world where they are manufactured.

'This curious circumstance (says Murray) is owing to a peculiar mixture of clay and sand, which the flood and ebb tides deposit in turn at these particular points. The sediment having been removed from the river is consolidated by drying, and cut into oblong masses, which are the Bath bricks, as well known in China as in England, in Damascus as in London—but why so called it is difficult to say. The business gives employment to a great number of persons; 8,000,000 bricks, valued from £12,000 to £13,000 being made every year.'

Not far from these works are those of the Dunball Company, for the manufacture of Portland and Roman cement. The coal district lies chiefly in another part of the county. Radstock is the centre of it. Frances, Countess of Waldegrave, is the chief coal-owner, and over five thousand persons are employed in raising this mineral. The lead mines of Somersetshire were once famous, but can now be hardly said to exist. They were situated in the Mendip Hills, and very curious are the old laws which governed their working. These date from Edward IV. In his time Lord Choke was sent to inquire into divers complaints which had been raised. It was then

decreed that any one before breaking ground to obtain ore, must receive permission from the lord of the soil; but (so early was 'fixity of tenure' sanctioned) when the leave was once granted, it needed not to be asked again. Similarly, when leave had been given to erect smelting places, that leave could not be withdrawn, so long as the premises were kept in tenantable repair and a tithe of the produce was paid in rent. It was also ordered that if any man stole lead to the value of one shilling and a penny halfpenny,

'The lord or his officer may arrest all his lead-works, house, and earth, with all his groofs and works, to keep them as safely to his own use, and shall take the persons that hath so offended and bring him where his house is or his works; and all the tools and instruments which to the occupier belongs he useth, and put him into the said house, and set fire on all together about him, and banish him from that occupation before the miners for ever. If that person doth pick or steal there any more, he shall be tryed by law, for that law and custom hath no more to do with him.'

Every lord was bound to keep two miners' courts every year, and swear twelve men of the same occupation, for redress of misdemeanours touching the minerals. The lord was permitted to arrest for 'strife between man and man,' or for his own dues when these were not paid. If any miner 'by misfortune take his death by earth falling upon him,' the workmen were bound to dig him out though he were 'forty fathoms under earth, and the coroner shall not have to do with him.' The amount of lead raised at West Chewton was estimated at £100,000. Some enterprising person noticing that there was an immense quantity of slag around Priddy Pool, from which the ore had been only partially extracted, resmelted this refuse, but the price of lead was so low that, though he obtained a considerable quantity, he did not profit much. About seventy years ago it was proposed to drive an adit six miles long through the Mendips, and if this had been done no doubt fresh veins of ore would have been discovered. But the project was abandoned. This is not the only great scheme unrealised. About thirty-five years ago it was proposed to construct a canal from the river Parrett to Seaton by way of Ilminster, Chard, and Axminster. The work would have been about forty-two miles in length, and its greatest elevation would have been 226 feet. It was to have been constructed of such a depth that ships would have been able to navigate it; and thus communication would have been established between the Bristol and the English Channels that would have saved the long and often dangerous voyage round the Land's End. The surveys for this work were made, but, a commercial crisis supervening, the project was abandoned. After that, canals gave place to railways. Within the last ten

years a line has been constructed which connects the two channels, but it has not been successful commercially, and of course only in a small degree carries out the original idea. In works of reclamation Somersetshire has long been prominent. An attempt was made by the abbots of Glastonbury to drain the great level of Brent Marsh, which lies between the Mendip hills and Bridgwater Bay. They cut a canal which reduced to a lake of 500 acres the waters that previously overspread the lowlands surrounding the abbey. The dissolution of the abbey was attended here, as elsewhere, by lamentable results. That change was accomplished ostensibly out of zeal for religion, really out of personal covetousness, and the great works set on foot by the monks were abandoned by their successors. Thus the reclaimed land in Brent Marsh became a bog. After the cessation of the American war in 1783, a general stimulus was given to agriculture, the attention of the landowners of Somersetshire was directed to the wastes in the western portion of the county, and an Act of Parliament was passed authorising drainage and enclosure. To carry out these works a sum of £60,000 was levied upon the proprietors in the district of the river Brue. This work was so successfully completed that application was made for powers to reclaim Brent Marsh, and this tract was reclaimed at a cost of £41,000. As far back as the time of James I., the draining of Sedgemoor had been in contemplation. That Sovereign, in fact, claimed the moor in order to effect this object. The inhabitants opposed the claim, and offered to surrender 4,000 acres to the King for his experiment. His death caused the project to fall through. Three hundred years prior to that, in 1304, the effect of draining in diminishing ague was pointed out, and an Act of Parliament was passed appointing Commissioners of Sewers for the district. At the present time there are thousands of acres in the great Bridgwater level capable of being at least doubled in value by perfect drainage and the subsequent application of mineral manures.

The word 'moor' is applied in Somersetshire not only to the marshes which border Bridgwater Bay, and which are in some parts actually below the level of the sea, but also to the mountainous region bordering Devonshire, and known as Exmoor. The central part of this district, comprising about 20,000 acres, formed the ancient Forest of Exmoor, and was enclosed by an Act of Parliament passed in 1815. At that time it was purchased by a Worcestershire gentleman named Knight, who proposed converting the forest into pastures. His object was better than the means he took to

realise it. He launched out into heavy and useless expenses. He encircled the whole forest with a ring fence, and commenced building a castellated mansion at Simonsbath, which he was unable to finish, and which soon became a picturesque ruin. His son and successor, Mr. Frederick Knight, was more fortunate because more moderate in his ideas. He called to his assistance Mr. Robert Smith, of Emmet's Grange, who subsequently became one of the most noted agriculturists in the West of England. This gentleman saw that the best way to make this region productive was to form hill-side catch-meadows; that is, to cut small water courses on the hill side, from which the stream is allowed to trickle down over the surface of the ground, and thereby make the ground yield luxuriant pasturage. Exmoor is famous also for its ponies and its deer. The value of the first has greatly increased of late years. In 1816 one could be purchased for under twenty-five shillings. Small as these horses are, they possess great endurance and are very long lived. Mr. Collyns in his entertaining 'Notes on the Chase of the Wild Deer,' mentions that these ponies will keep up with full grown hunters in a long day's chase, and have the additional advantage of knowing how to get over boggy ground in which their competitors would flounder and sink. Mr. Collyns has known the Exmoor pony reach twenty-three years of age. The wild deer is still to be found in the treeless forest. The chase of the deer has been carried on uninterruptedly since the days of Queen Elizabeth, and probably from a much earlier date. A day's hunt in that region will show how true to nature are the lines

'As pants the hart for cooling streams  
When heated with the chase.'

Wearied with the long run—two dozen miles is no unusual length—the stag will, if he comes across one of the small ponds with which Exmoor abounds, plunge into it and emerge with new life. Scarcely able to stand before, he will afterwards continue his flight as vigorously as though he had just commenced it. The discovery of haematite iron on Exmoor has not yet led to the disappearance of the deer, nor is it likely to cause the destruction of the moorland scenery. The drive from Lynmouth to Watchet is one of the most beautiful in England, and the view from the hill looking down upon Porlock is of surpassing loveliness. The Quantock hills, though they rise to a considerable height—Dunkerry Beacon being 1,668 feet above the sea—are generally more cultivated than Exmoor, and abound with

woods. Very different from both regions is the Vale of Taunton, which McCulloch says is the most fertile district in the kingdom. It rests for the most part on the new red sandstone formation. Here, and also on the rich grazing lands in the neighbourhood of Glastonbury and Cheddar, is made the famous cheese which takes its name from the last-mentioned place. This production is not, however, an object of unmixed satisfaction. The women do nearly all the work. 'It is a sad sight,' says Mr. Acland, 'to see a man standing by doing nothing, while his wife or daughter is turning many times in the day a weight of about half a cwt.' It was at North Peherton, between Glastonbury and Bruton, that, what was probably the largest cheese in the world, was made as a present for the Queen. The same dairy districts are noted for their clotted cream, which is almost, though not quite, identical with the better-known Devonshire cream. We must not leave the agriculture of Somerset without mentioning the very great benefits conferred upon it by the Bath and West of England Society. This association owed its existence to Edmund Rack, a literary Quaker, who settled in Bath in the year 1775. Three years later he published letters suggesting the formation of an association for the promotion of agriculture and arts, and his suggestion was at once adopted. For more than seventy years the society had but a feeble existence, but about twenty years ago a fresh impetus was given to it chiefly by Somersetshire men. It held yearly exhibitions and extended its operations from county to county, until now it has become second in importance only to the Royal Agricultural Society itself, and covers the whole of the south and west of England. The yearly volumes of the society's 'Journal' are most valuable contributions to agricultural literature.

The traveller through Somersetshire is struck by the luxuriance of the pastures, the stately timber in the hedge-rows, and above all by the orchards. These last, if seen early in May, with their delicate pink blossoms hiding the leaves, or in September, with their ruddy fruit bending the boughs well nigh to the ground, are exceedingly beautiful. Unfortunately, the philanthropist cannot gaze on them with the same enthusiasm which the artist feels. The second does not know, as the first does, that though the fruit is fair to look upon, the apple tree is anything but a tree of life. The produce is converted into cider, and cider is the staple food, if food it can be called, of the Somersetshire peasant. In an article upon Devonshire, published in this magazine two years ago, we described the cider truck system,

as it prevailed in that county. It prevails no less in West Somerset. The joint authors of the essay on the cider system, which gained the prize offered by Sir Walter Trevelyan about a dozen years ago, published some interesting evidence on this subject from Somersetshire men. Mr. T. D. Acland, now M.P. for North Devon, says of the practice by which labourers are paid a portion of their wages in cider:—

'The masters and the men play into each other's hands; the women and children suffer; and the men in the long run. The labourer in a year takes off his master's hands about two hogsheads of cider, and satisfies one of his bodily appetites at the cost of fifteen per cent. of his earnings. The liquor refreshes and stimulates him, but wears him out; for common cider is not nourishing, but exciting, like spirit and water. West county labourers will never be what they might be as long as this system goes on.'

Similarly, Lord Portman remarks that 'the masters take an unfair advantage by stimulating the labourer to induce him to over-exert himself.' Sir Arthur Elton says that 'when the quantity of cider given is considerable—as, for instance, in mowing, when a man gets about a shilling a day—there cannot be a question that a money payment would be preferable.' Mr. R. Walters, of Perticombe Well, South Petherton, declares that—

'An abundant produce of cider proves a curse rather than a blessing to the lower classes of the district, for, when plentiful, the farmers, who depend upon a crop of apples for payment of a part of their rent, naturally expect the labourers to make use of it as part of wages; and in many instances they are compelled to do so. Their families derive no benefit, and the result is frequently poverty. In harvest times the case is worse, frequent intoxication distinguishing this period. Since the scarcity and high price of cider the cider shops have been much less frequented, and much less disorder and fewer breaches of the peace have occurred.'

Mr. Hansard, surgeon, of Montacute, was, if possible, more emphatic. He declared that men would frequently in harvest time drink from eight to twenty pints a day, and, as a consequence, would come home excited, and often fall victims to serious accidents. Referring to the then existing scarcity of apples, and consequent dearness of cider, he said:—

'The failure of the apple crop has had the same favourable effects on the general health of the labourer as the good drainage of a parish has on the health of the inhabitants generally; and in proof of this I may mention the flourishing condition of our Friendly Societies, the money paid to sick members being much less than usual.'

Some of the correspondents who supplied Messrs. Spender and Isaac with evidence in their essay thought that if the labourer were not provided with cider by his employer, he would go to the cider shop and get it for himself, and would then be more likely to form habits of drunkenness; but, as Mr. Hansard pointed out, the amount that the labourer

receives as part payment of wages only creates the thirst for this drink, and induces him to frequent the cider shop. Clearly, too, the system is in direct antagonism to the principles of political economy. If the labourer prefers to have a portion of his earnings in cider, he ought to be able to buy in the open market, and not to have forced upon him the nauseous, and often noxious, trash that the farmers now give him. As a matter of fact a large number of workmen would prefer to have their wages entirely in money, and the more intelligent they are the clearer is their judgment in the matter. Several years ago certain Somersetshire employers abandoned the cider truck system, and with the best results. Mr. Danger, of Huntstile, for instance, very wisely did not compel his labourers to work without cider, for this they would have thought a hardship which would have set them against the alteration. He left the matter to their own free choice. The men's wages were raised one shilling and sixpence a week in lieu of the cider payment, and the men who chose to have the cider had so much less money. The result was that as a rule, and especially during the winter months, they preferred the money.

The social condition of Somersetshire is by no means satisfactory. Some years ago Mr. Bentley spoke of it as having fewer schools and a higher rate of crime than any other county except Northampton. Present statistics would seem to shew that crime is certainly not on the decrease, although the offences are perhaps of a somewhat milder type than formerly. Wages paid to farm labourers are, according to Messrs. Spender and Isaac's 'Essay on the Agricultural Labourer of the West of England' (published in the Journal of the Bath and West of England Society, for 1858), eight shillings to ten shillings, with cider, three pints per diem, at from sixpence to tenpence per gallon. This is a higher rate than prevails in Devonshire and Dorsetshire; and Canon Girdlestone has lately incurred much odium from the farmers of East Devonshire through his efforts to raise the wages of the farm labourer by emigration. Of late some improvement, sorely needed, has been effected in the labourer's cottage, and attempts have been made to establish labourers' boarding-houses, but not with much success. What Somersetshire chiefly needs is not so much a semi-eleemosynary grant of money as an investment of capital on sound commercial principles. M. Leonce de Lavergne, in his most interesting volume, '*Economie Rurale de l'Angleterre*', was much struck by this fact. He was surprised to find so much suffering among the working classes of a county which has such important markets as Bristol and

Bath. He ascribed it to the excess of population, which had increased from 280,000 to 460,000 souls during the fifty years 1801-51, and had led to undue competition for the land. He held that the only remedy was either an increase of production or a decrease of population. Both changes have been at work to some extent. A portion of the 20,000 acres of waste land in Exmoor which scandalised him has been reclaimed, and the population has, like that of nearly all the agricultural counties, diminished. Between 1811 and 1821 the increase was 17 per cent.; between 1851 and 1861 it was only 0·2 per cent., which, taking Bristol and Bath into account, would imply a considerable reduction in the purely rural districts. It is not probable that this downward rate of progress will be checked. There is doubtless plenty of room for the employment of labour on Exmoor, but the question 'How will it pay?' cannot be answered in such a manner as to encourage any large investment of capital. Meanwhile, it is worthy of mention that a few members of that fast vanishing class, the yeomen who farm their own land, are still to be found in the neighbourhood of Bridgwater. Concerning them, Mr. Gabriel Poole of that town writes:—

'It is impossible to say where the gentry end and the yeomen begin. Numbers of the tenantry began life as labourers; then took some potato or tease-ground at a high rent, then rented some cows, until they had saved enough to provide for themselves; then they took a field here, and another field there, till they had saved enough to stock a farm; and then they rent one.'

In that district, although many of the estates are mortgaged, wages are higher than in other parts of Somersetshire.

At the present time, when education is so prominently discussed, an article like this would be very incomplete without some reference to the intellectual status of the county. The report drawn up by Mr. C. H. Stanton, one of the assistant commissioners of the Royal Commission on Middle Class Education, presents anything but a satisfactory account. There are fifteen endowed schools in Somersetshire, but these, as in other counties, have a tendency to cluster together. Thus, Ilminster, Chard, Crewkerne, Langport, and Yeovil are all near together, but there is no endowed school west of Taunton, and none in the great agricultural district north of Shepton Mallet, and between the Mendip hills and a line drawn from Bristol to Bath. The education carried on at these schools is primarily for the upper classes, and there are a large number of private schools which must be placed in the same category. The instruction given at them Mr. Stanton found to be for the most part of the superficial character with which the report of the Royal

Commissioners has made us familiar. The schools for the lowest class—those supported by the parochial clergy or by the Nonconformist bodies—are probably as good as others of the same kind elsewhere. It is in the middle-class schools that Somersetshire is most wofully deficient. Many of the farmers will not, some cannot, afford £25 a year to send their sons to a boarding school, or, if they do so, it is only for a year, in order that their sons may get ‘finished.’

‘Boys of this description (says Mr. Stanton) I often met with, the earlier rudiments of their education having been learnt sometimes from a sort of nursery governess where there is a large family, or at the village school, or by lessons from the village schoolmaster during the evening. Such boys I have seen, and felt the profoundest sympathy for. Fine strapping fellows ‘bloused with health and wind and rain,’ are unequally yoked with sharp little boys from the town, half their age, less than half their size; where they were sensitive, as I believe was often the case, exposed to the perpetual mortification of the consciousness of intellectual infirmity, or when of a blunter feeling, themselves often doing injury to those around by the coarser exhibition of mere animal life.’

Altogether, Somersetshire is a county more fair to look at than really prosperous. It has had a stirring history; it has given birth to great men; it presents much physical and social variety; but it is by no means among the foremost counties in manufactures or agriculture, in education or morals.

---

#### THE GRETTONS, OF HIGHFLY.

‘**O**WE no man anything,’ is perhaps one of the least regarded of all the Apostolic injunctions. Whether it has been so in all the centuries of this Christian era, we are not called upon to decide; but concerning this enlightened nineteenth century, we are free to reiterate our assertion that folks in general too often disregard that portion of Holy Writ which commands them to keep out of debt.

Our commercial life is so interpenetrated by the credit system, that it seems impossible that it could ever be brought to thrive independently of it. And, indeed, it were vain to anticipate a time when the larger commercial transactions of nations could be conducted on the ‘ready-money’ system. That time will never arrive; the very conditions of things preclude the possibility of it. But in minor business transactions, amongst many families, a complete revolution might gradually be easily brought about; and what a blessed revolution it would be! ‘Nobler modes of life’ would obtain

amongst us, without waiting for millennium bells to usher them in. How much more honest and honourable the units composing this great nation, and, consequently, the nation as a whole, would become! We should have less of that anxiety, care, and shame abroad which wither up men's energies far more quickly than the hardest mental or bodily toil; we should have less of that mad and shameful struggle to keep up false appearances; we should see fewer of those deplorably long lists of bankrupts' names in our daily papers; we should have a few thousands less of that despicable *genus*, the 'fast young man'; we should have lighter hearts around us, and more peace and happiness in family circles than many thousands of our bonnie English homes can boast of under the present state of things.

Next to actual, downright crime, there is nothing like debt to plant thorns in a man's pillow, and scare sleep from weary eyes. The imagination of a Dante could not conjure up a spectre more horribly haunting than this one of debt; it clings to a man like his own shadow, and embitters his whole life, waking and sleeping.

But it must not be supposed that the suffering is all on the side of the debtor. Indeed, it often happens that the creditor fares the worst by far. Some folks are so devoid of conscience and every right feeling, that they would feel nothing of the 'incubus of debt,' though they owed money to a thousand men, and had no prospect of ever paying one of them a penny. Perhaps it would be too much to say that those who are anxious to pay their debts are the exceptions; but it is certain that a very large proportion of debtors care nothing for the inconvenience and trouble to which they put their creditors, and would never exert themselves to pay at all, did not a court of justice loom before them in the distance.

Of this class of persons were the Grettons.

Mr. and Mrs. Gretton were highly-respectable, middle-class people. They were prominent folks in the small town of Highfly, and were considered by everybody (excepting their creditors) to be in the height of prosperity. Mr. Gretton was regarded by his humbler fellow-townsfolk as 'a very fine man, grand in his way;' and by those of his own class, 'of military appearance, very *distingué*.' He did not wear long hair and spectacles, as many of his brother professionals did; but his light hair was pomatumed and parted behind in orthodox Rotten Row style, and he displayed a coarse, tawny beard and moustache, which any 'fierce hussar' under the sun might have envied. Whatever other folks thought, it was not to be doubted that Mr. Bernard Gretton, as he stalked

through the streets of Highfly, five feet ten in his creaking boots, thought himself a most charming and handsome personage. He stepped as though he thought it ; he smiled upon his lady acquaintances as though he felt certain that they thought it, as, indeed, many of them did ; for it cannot be denied that there are numbers of women who never look beneath a fine exterior for anything to admire in man.

Mrs. Gretton was a worthy spouse of such a specimen of humanity as fortune had favoured her with. She was pronounced to be ‘a fine woman.’ She was nearly as tall as her husband, ample in her breadth and in her mode of dressing, which gave her a most substantial appearance. She was always cool and placid in manner ; very few things ever ruffled her ease and comfort. The little troubles which fret other women to distraction, broke against her as against a rock, and spent themselves without disturbing her. Feeling little herself, she felt very little for other people. Beggars in the street solicited alms of her with about as much hope of success as they would have had in kneeling at the foot of Nelson’s column, and begging his stony honour to fling them a copper. Placid and heartless, with her cold, dark eyes, and plump, hard-set face, she held on her way through the world as if it had been created solely for her benefit ; as if all that other people had to do was to help to make it as comfortable as possible for her, and not ruffle or thwart her in the very least.

This woman was the mother of five children : a fine growing family of two boys and three girls. The eldest was a lad of twelve years ; the next two were girls. Digby, the young hopeful of twelve, attended a ‘preparatory school for young gentlemen ;’ the two little girls were under the care of a nursery governess.

Mrs. Gretton was proud of her children, and she foolishly fostered pride in them. She thoroughly impregnated their minds with the fact that they were descended from the great Grettons, of Gretton Hall, Boshshire, and that, consequently, they were superior to all the people with whom they associated in Highfly. If their poor dear papa had had ‘his rights’ (whatever that might mean), he would not now be dependent on his talents for a living ; he would be on a par with his relatives, who kept their carriages, and lived in style becoming an old aristocratic family.

Little Digby was duly inflated by all this, and adopted the tone of ‘our family is far better than yours’ to his schoolfellows, which procured him many a ‘licking’ from them that he would have escaped had he been less arrogant. Schoolboys, as a rule, have a decided aversion from the young prig who claims

to be the produce of some superior olive-tree, and they peck at him accordingly.

Geraldine, the eldest girl, was not thus impressed by her mother's reiterated accounts of their family's former glory and greatness. She was a simple, loving-hearted child, and more thoughtful and quiet than girls of ten years of age usually are. She was very dissatisfied with her family relationships. Her mother was cold and official in her manner, rather than maternal; and her father seemed to care for nothing but their getting on with their studies, that they might appear accomplished and brilliant in the eyes of the world of Highfly.

Poor little Geraldine felt that irrepressible heart-yearning which is part of the sorrowful lot of orphans, and of those children whose parents withhold from them that love and sympathy, and tender interest, for which all little hearts are more or less hungry.

Fortunately for Geraldine, the nursery-governess in whose charge she was, proved to be one who thoroughly understood and appreciated the child; and in time Geraldine learned to carry all her little troubles to Miss Bright, and looked to her for that advice and comfort which she could not get from her parents.

Miss Bright was a sensible girl, and she did her best to cultivate in Geraldine a spirit of love and ardent appreciation of all that is true and genuine in life, and a contempt for all that is false and empty and mere show. This was no difficult task, for Geraldine seemed possessed of an instinctive aversion from bombast and hollow pretences. There was little fear that she would lightly tread in her parents' footsteps, in their 'walking in a vain show.'

By the time she had grown to early womanhood, she had learned enough of their mode of living to harass and distress her much. She ventured to protest against many things which appeared to her foolish and sinful. This caused a complete breach between herself and her mother, and she became the 'henpecked' member of the family. Young Mr. Digby especially took upon himself to worry her with petty persecutions, of which young men of his stamp are highly capable.

Digby was now twenty years old, but much older than his years in the ways of the world. His training was bringing forth fruit, and the result was an empty-headed, vain, unprincipled youth, with an inordinate love of display, and with a sense of honour so small that it never interfered with any of his selfish purposes. He was not without talents of a certain order, and these he was now exercising under a well-known architect in the town. But his heart was not in his

work, and it was not to be expected that he would ever excel in it. He was engrossed by those unmanly, enervating pursuits which have such a charm for our ‘fast young men ;’ billiard-playing, dancing, resorting to frivolous—not to say vicious—places of amusement, from all which a youth of sound, healthy tastes would soon turn in distaste and disgust.

His parents thought but little of his moral and mental growth ; they looked at his outer man, and were highly satisfied. Was he not one of the handsomest young fellows in Highfly ? Did he not look like a young lord in dress and manner ? Was he not a credit to his family, even its most aristocratic branches ? Mr. and Mrs. Gretton loftily answered these questions in the affirmative, and were satisfied.

True, the ‘get-up’ of this fine specimen of British youth was rather expensive to them, and Mr. Gretton sometimes ventured to deplore it to his wife ; but she invariably silenced him with the assurance that it was an inevitable necessity—that the dear lad must make an appearance in the world, and be a credit to them ; and what expense was he compared to some ?

‘If I could afford it, I should not say a word, my dear,’ was Mr. Gretton’s rejoinder ; ‘I am quite as gratified as you are to see him what he is, but I must see that he does not go too far in expenditure. I cannot afford everything, you know.’

‘But you must afford what is requisite, Mr. Gretton. When Digby becomes established, he will be a wealthy man, and whatever debts we may incur for him he will then pay ; meanwhile, our creditors must be willing to wait. I should like you to intimate thus much to Hillyer, the tailor, please, when you pass his way. He has had the impertinence to send twice for a settlement of the last bill.’

‘When was it delivered ?’

‘Only nine months ago, just fancy !’ said Mrs. Gretton, with a short laugh. ‘Just let him know, Bernard, that we shall pay it when it is quite convenient to us, and that may be some time within the next five years !’

‘At the same time, I must forbid Digby getting anything there or elsewhere without my knowledge and sanction. So long as these affairs were in your hands, Maria, I was content to say nothing, though I have had so much difficulty in satisfying and keeping quiet our numerous creditors, that I should have been overwhelmed with anxiety were I a man who permitted such things to fret him. But I cannot entrust Digby with the power to spend as he pleases.’

‘But it is nonsense, my dear, to say that Digby must come

to you for every shilling's worth he wants. My children, with the exception of Geraldine, who is a crochety, niggardly girl, take after me ; they are children of spirit and taste. That spirit must not be broken ; it will be the making of them, Bernard ; and that taste must be gratified as far as possible. Consequently, you must put no unreasonable fetters on Digby. Surely you have confidence in his gentlemanly instincts, which will never let him go far wrong, you may depend.'

Mr. Gretton silently acquiesced.

'What do you think of Geraldine?' continued Mrs. Gretton. 'She is opposing my wish to send her to a London finishing-school for a year or two—opposing it to the utmost. She wants to begin teaching music and drawing at once, and she is only eighteen. Fancy having the Smiths and Robinsons saying that we put our girl to earning money before she was out of her teens ! And their girls are going to London. When I insist on carrying out my plans, Geraldine pleads and protests, and actually cries about it. I am afraid she is of an avaricious disposition ; she seems so anxious to get money.'

'She hasn't showed herself very avaricious in other respects,' said Mr. Gretton. 'She is generally very unselfish, and has been the least expensive of our children hitherto.'

'I attribute that to niggardliness, Bernard. I have heard of misers wearing their clothes till they dropped off them bit by bit ; now I really believe Geraldine would do the very same thing. I never yet bought her anything but she protested against it, and pronounced it superfluous. She cares nothing for fashion, and would wear the same clothes till they were threadbare, without ever thinking of the old fashion of them, I do believe. She is the only one—I am sorry to say it, but it is truth—she is the only one of our family who does not care to keep up its respectability and position. I'll venture to say she'd go out to-morrow as a nursery governess, if I'd let her ! I am afraid Miss Bright instilled anything but proper ideas into her head : then she is naturally low in her tastes.'

'No, no ; not low, my dear,' said Mr. Gretton, deprecatingly. 'I think Geraldine is quite refined and lady-like in her ways, though I grant she is not showy and brilliant, as I should like to see her.'

'I maintain that her tastes are decidedly plebeian, and, surely, that is low,' persisted Mrs. Gretton. 'I am sure she doesn't take after my family, and it is equally certain that she can't take after the Grettions, of Gretton Hall.'

'Just so,' assented Mr. Gretton.

'Well, what about this teaching?' asked Mrs. G.

'I will think about it, and speak to Geraldine,' was the reply.

'But you will not agree to it, Bernard?'

'Probably not, my dear; don't be alarmed.'

Geraldine's wish to earn money arose from her increasing knowledge of the state of their family affairs. She was thoughtful, observant, and conscientious; and as she came to see that all their family dignity was mere hollow pretence and wicked hypocrisy, and that it was maintained at the sacrifice of principle, she felt that she must do something in the way of making a stand for right and honesty. Things came to her ears which fretted her soul greatly; she felt persuaded that a crash and an exposure must inevitably take place ere long. As she looked at circumstances, and thought upon them, the wonder to her was that no crash had come hitherto. But she supposed that as long as the expenditure was conducted by her parents alone, they managed to keep it somehow under control. Now that Digby was taking upon himself to manage his own personal expenses, so far as purchasing was concerned, leaving them to murmur and pay at their convenience, it seemed to Geraldine that ruin must follow. For Digby was showy, extravagant, and unprincipled; and he lavished upon himself superfluities, at his father's expense, which were unbecoming in his position, even if he could have afforded them.

Geraldine little knew what scheming and contriving there had been in all the past years to keep their heads above the sea of debt in which they were immersed. But now it appeared to her that nothing could ever possibly set them straight, unless, indeed, one of her father's grand relatives should happen to die, and leave them a little fortune. Mrs. Gretton often spoke of this, and seemed to reckon on it as a certainty; but it inspired Geraldine with very little hope.

It frequently came to the girl's knowledge that her parents were being dunred for money; and in some instances the repeated postponement of payments seemed to distress and harass the creditors; for they owed money to men of all degrees. Proprietors of large and well-established concerns could afford to take promises instead of cash from Mr. Gretton sometimes, without suffering in consequence; but there were creditors of lower degree, on whom the repeated delays entailed most distressing inconvenience.

Of this class was a young man who had opened a shop in Highfly a year or two previously. It was not a large shop; but he kept first-class goods in the drapery and outfitting

line. He came to Highfly from a large London house, bringing with him an excellent character, and the savings of eight or nine years of faithful service. It was quite a nice bit of capital to begin with ; and he was full of hope that success would attend his efforts. He was a native of Highfly, and when he went to London, at the age of sixteen, he left behind him a widowed mother, and a girlish friend who was destined to be his wife. Now he had both with him, and a very happy little family they were. Old Mrs. Saunders and young Mrs. Saunders agreed beautifully together ; and George Saunders was strong in his determination that nothing should be wanting on his part to make his business successful, and so to bring prosperity to those dependent on his exertions.

Young Mrs. Saunders threw her heart into his work, and undertook to serve in the shop herself, and help him in keeping the books, so that he might not incur the expense of an assistant at first. Saunders issued circulars to the Highfly matrons, begging their patronage and support, and he had not to beg in vain ; for those who went to his shop once, invariably went again and again : they met with such civility and attention, and were really quite satisfied with the goods that were proffered them for sale ; there was no puffing-up of unworthy articles—all were genuine, and cheap, too.

Mrs. Gretton was one of Saunders's ready patronesses. She rustled into his little shop with a grand patronising air, and delighted the obliging shopman by giving him a large order. She condescended to praise his taste in the selection of his stock, and promised him that, although she had an account at Riggems' (the largest drapers in the town), she would be able to give him a little support, as she had a large family, and required many things in that line. She languidly selected a great pile of articles, not one of which she really needed, and not one quarter of which she would have bought, if she had had to pay for them there and then. This is the great evil of the credit system as practised by families ; it is a temptation to them to indulge in extravagancies, which a ready-money purse would peremptorily forbid.

'This will make a beginning to a little account,' said Mrs. Gretton, as she rose from her chair, which she had occupied fully an hour. 'If I find nothing to complain of in these goods, you may depend upon an amount of my patronage, and my recommendation also.' And amid the thanks of the elated shopman, she sailed majestically out.

Mr. Digby, too, condescended to favour Saunders with his patronage. Digby found the shop greatly to his liking. Shirts, fronts, collars, &c., of new and elaborate make,

glorious ties, and the daintiest French kid gloves, took his fancy immensely, and caused him to be one of Saunders's most frequent customers. These items being constantly added to Mrs. Gretton's 'little bill,' increased it to such a length, that it could no longer be called little—at least Saunders and his wife did not call it so. When, at the end of six months, they made it out and sent it in, they were glad to think how capitally it would help them to meet the bills which would soon fall due to their London houses.

Of course Mrs. Gretton did not pay. She took not the slightest notice of the bill. She never did of any bill until it had been sent in two or three times, and then she merely deigned to say it was not quite convenient to settle it at that particular time, but she would attend to it shortly.

Saunders suffered by others, too ; Mrs. Gretton was not the only matron in Highfly who graciously got into his debt, and ungraciously neglected to pay. And Saunders, being a beginner, did not like to press them or compel them to pay, lest he should offend them, and drive such ready buyers from his shop.

In the course of a year or two this told unmistakably upon him. What he had in hand when he decided to come to Highfly was not sufficient to get him such a stock as he needed to begin with ; but he was sanguine that his efforts to please, and strict attention to business, would soon bring him such a run of success as would enable him to go on capitally. Vain expectations ! when his supporters were such as Mrs. Gretton.

One day she sent Geraldine to the shop for some little things, and Mrs. Saunders served her. The little woman appeared heavy-eyed and dejected, very different from what she was when they first began business, Geraldine thought. Presently Mr. Saunders came up, fidgetting round his wife, as if he wanted to say something to Geraldine. At length, he said, ' You'll excuse me, miss ; but would you kindly ask Mrs. Gretton if she could oblige me with a settlement of her bill this week ?—Even a part of it would do me an immense service just now. It has run on now rather longer than I feel I can afford to allow, at present, not having thoroughly established my business yet. I hope you will excuse my mentioning it to you, miss ; but sometimes I fear that the servants don't deliver my requests to Mrs. Gretton, as I have called several times within the past year.'

' I will tell mamma what you say,' promised Geraldine, kindly.

When Mr. Saunders had returned to his desk, Mrs.

Saunders ventured to try to smooth matters, as women will, by being apologetic and confidential. ‘I am sure, miss, my husband would not mention payment to one of his debtors were he not really pushed into a corner for money. Our business is very good, but it is nearly all credit; if we could just get in steadily what is owing to us we should have no anxiety; but, as it is, we sometimes hardly know which way to turn. It would oblige us very greatly if you would take the trouble to lay this before your mamma, though I feel quite ashamed to trouble you.’

‘Don’t mention that,’ said Geraldine, touched by the little woman’s anxiety and timidity, ‘a year is a long time for a tradesman to wait for money.’

‘O it is nearly two years now,’ said Mrs. Saunders, ‘and really that is not considered very long, and perhaps we should not feel it so, either, if we were more established.’

Geraldine felt both ashamed and sorry as she walked home. It was just at this time that her mother was so desirous that she should go to London to school. ‘I think mamma must be insane to wish me to go to school and put her to such needless expense, when she is obliged to keep these poor people waiting for money so long,’ she said to herself, with a vehement determination to withstand such an arrangement to the utmost. ‘I will not be adding to the dreadful home expenses any longer, I will earn money.’

Full of interest and sympathy for Saunders and his wife, Geraldine gave their request to her mother at once, with supplementary pleadings of her own. Mrs. Gretton listened to her unmoved, and, when she had done, quietly said, ‘It is very much like Saunders’s impertinence to speak to one of my children about his bill. I have a mind to say I will withdraw my support from him. You seem unduly concerned about him, Miss Gretton. Pray don’t agitate yourself: he will be paid when I find it convenient to send to him.’

‘But consider, mamma, how anxious he is, and how dreadfully he wants it, and how long it has been owing. He says even a part of it would be a very great help to him,’ said Geraldine.

‘Mind your own business, and let me hear no more of this,’ said Mrs. Gretton, with a sternness that silenced Geraldine.

It so happened that within that very same week, which was about Michaelmas time, Geraldine was aware of three or four applications at the house for money. One was from a jeweller to Master Digby, another was from the tailor, a third from a milliner for Mrs. Gretton, and each applicant seemed to

Geraldine like a messenger of evil, threatening the family with destruction. A fourth was Mrs. Saunders, who requested to speak with Geraldine.

Curious and wondering, Geraldine went down to the hall, to see who might want to speak to her at the hour of nine in the evening. ‘O, I beg your pardon,’ said Mrs. Saunders, nervously, and with the same heavy, anxious look in her eyes, ‘but I know you are very kind, and I ran out to the post for my husband, as he is unwell, and unknown to him I am come to ask you if you mentioned that to your mamma, miss. To-morrow is the day my husband has to meet a bill at the bank. I don’t exactly understand about it, but I know that if it isn’t met it will be almost ruin to us; and he has been so unfortunate in trying to get some bills in this week. He is so anxious, that I am dreadfully concerned about him; and I thought if I could prevail upon Mrs. Gretton to let us have thirty or forty pounds to-morrow, it would lift a load of care from us.’

‘Thirty or forty pounds,’ said Geraldine; ‘is it so much?’

‘It is about seventy altogether, miss; because, you see, Mr. Digby’s bill was reckoned in with it, as your mamma directed, and his was over twenty.’

‘Well, I hope mamma will be able to do something; I will speak to her again,’ said Geraldine.

And she did speak, but with no success. The only feeling that moved Mrs. Gretton was indignation at her creditor’s ‘impertinence.’

Then Geraldine spoke in secret to Digby, and begged him not to be getting in debt, and having foolish, extravagant things. But he only laughed at her, calling her a niggard and a prude, and one who knew nothing of a young gentleman’s requirements. ‘I must keep up an appearance,’ he said, ‘and as I have no cash to do it with, excepting what I can borrow from generous friends, I must adopt mamma’s plan; and if she doesn’t grumble, surely you needn’t. Dishonourable, did you say? Ha! ha! There are different notions of honour, and no doubt yours and mine differ.’ And with a twist of his perfumed person, Digby carried himself out of the room, and so ended the unpalatable conversation. A few days elapsed, and, to Geraldine’s great surprise and grief, the news reached her that Saunders had become a bankrupt. ‘Ah, I thought he was going a-head too fast for a young beginner,’ said Mrs. Gretton, calmly. But the thought that now his affairs were in the hands of lawyers, and that, consequently, it was of no use trying to delay paying

her bill much longer, did rather move her. ‘When I must I must,’ she said, which meant that now she must speak to her husband about it.

Geraldine went out directly to see Mrs. Saunders. She found the little family of four—husband, wife, the widowed mother, and a young baby—together in the gloomy house. The husband was ill in bed. Geraldine felt somehow guilty as Mrs. Saunders’s pale, tear-stained face met her at the door. ‘My family might have prevented this trouble,’ thought Geraldine. And she was wearing at that moment things that had been bought at that place and never paid for. ‘It is the last *unearned* dress that I will ever put on,’ said Geraldine, with an earnest purpose in her heart.

She went into the desolate home and tried to comfort the young mother. ‘O, I was so afraid at first, miss, that he would have to go to prison,’ she said with a sob. ‘But I think it will all be cleared up for us, and his character vindicated. I am sure we’ve lived poor enough to try to make the business answer, and pay every man his own; and it will be seen, when things come to be investigated, that we’ve been careful. Our bills and the stock will cover everything, I’m sure; but then we shall be left penniless to begin life over again; and all my husband’s hard-earned savings are swamped. If we could have got our bills in, I’m sure we should have gone on and made a good business in time. But Saunders was too obliging and merciful; and now this affair has so prostrated him, that I’m afraid he’ll never be himself again. He frets so, you know, miss, to think that he has me and baby and his mother to bring this trouble upon. But I don’t mind it a bit,’ added the brave little woman, ‘only for his sake.’

‘Well, in the midst of all your distress, Mrs. Saunders, you have the solace of knowing that you have been honest and energetic. This trouble may indeed be called a misfortune, not a fault.’

When Mr. Gretton heard of it, and learned what was required of him, he spoke more sharply to his wife on the subject of debt than he had ever done in his life before. Digby, forsooth, must be accumulating debts now. ‘Well, it will just come to this,’ said Mr. Gretton, ‘I shall have to run away.’

‘My dear,’ said Mrs. Gretton, calmly, ‘that is what you said ages ago, and you are here yet.’

‘And trouble enough I’ve had to keep here,’ he said. ‘Such a fight as it has been, with loans, and promissory notes, and duns innumerable! Remember, I can never

endure public exposure in Highfly. A man of my family would have his spirit utterly broken by public exposure. Digby is playing fast and free with my name ; I have been threatened with legal proceedings by Silver, the jeweller, this very day ; and, to tell you the truth, I could turn my pockets inside out this moment for all that is in them ; and there is none anywhere else, I'll assert. What do you think of that ? And now, here's a demand for seventy pounds for dress ! Pshaw ! the thing's ridiculous.'

' Seventy pounds for dress for such a family, for two years,' said Mrs. Gretton. ' What is that, I should like to know, including as it does a deal of Digby's ? You would not have him go shabby, Mr. Gretton ? At present he would not disgrace a nobleman, and I rejoice to see him so nice in his personal appearance and manner. You ought to be proud of your son.'

Mr. Gretton was proud of him, and would sooner have owed a large sum of money than have seen his son go about shabby. Still, in spite of all his vanity and want of principle, Mr. Gretton was beginning to feel that a check must be put upon spending, one way or another, or the consequences would be disastrous. All his life long up to the present moment it had been only by brazen daring and skilful, dishonourable manœuvring that he had kept himself free from the law. His affairs were in such a complicated condition that the least exposure would entail immediate and irremediable ruin upon himself and his family. But he secretly determined on not suffering exposure. ' When the climax comes I shall run,' was his decision.

At this juncture Geraldine's appeal to be allowed to get money by teaching, met with little opposition from him. Much to her joy, and greatly to Mrs. Gretton's chagrin and disgust, she got his consent to her going among her friends in a new character—as a canvasser for pupils. She was more successful than she had ventured to anticipate. It surprised her to meet with so much kindness from those of her acquaintances to whom she applied. The fact was, she was greatly respected for her amiable and humble character, and frank, unassuming manners. In the course of a fortnight she had obtained seven pupils ; and it was with a glad heart that she devoted herself to their improvement.

Through another six months the family struggled on, keeping up their false appearances as usual, visiting and entertaining visitors, until at length the crisis came. Mr. Gretton succeeded in getting from a gentleman of his acquaintance, named Kepp, a loan of thirty pounds (which he vehe-

mently promised to return during the week), and with that he made off to Liverpool, intending to go to America. But suspecting and outraged creditors had for some days been watching his every movement, and the consequence was that he was laid hold of as he was strutting about the deck of a steamer smoking his cigar with a bland and careless air ; and back to Highfly he was escorted, there to be lodged not a little less ostentatiously than he had been accustomed to be. A few days sufficed to make his home a complete wreck. Mrs. Gretton would not, or could not, act in any particular. She was utterly broken down. If some one had come and borne her off to the workhouse, it is likely that she would not have resisted. She dreaded to be seen ; she could not speak to any one.

The family was turned out of house and home. Happy was it for them, then, that they had the despised Geraldine to turn to. She was as brave as a lion, and stood up for them all. She went out and took two rooms for her mother, herself, and the younger children. They needed three at least, but it could not be afforded ; for rent, food, and everything else would have to be paid for out of her earnings, so they would have to suffer many a want which they had hitherto never known.

It so happened that the rooms were the very ones which the Saunderses had occupied when they had to give up their house and shop. Geraldine had called to see them there ; and now, knowing that they were in a little cottage of their own, she at once tried to get the rooms, and succeeded. Saunders was now serving at Riggem's, and his wife and mother took in sewing. They hoped to be able to commence business again in time ; but at present they could not see their way clear.

Geraldine heard with great distress of her father's last act of dishonesty, in borrowing money from Mr. Kepp. She very much respected Mr. and Mrs. Kepp, and had often visited them in days gone by. They had three children, old enough to receive instruction in music and drawing from Geraldine, and she begged to be permitted to teach them, with a view to offsetting the debt which her father owed. This was agreed to ; and twice a week Geraldine went there. She had now almost as many pupils as she could attend to, and thankful, indeed, was she for 'leave to toil.'

When Mrs. Gretton had somewhat aroused herself from the helpless state in which this turn of affairs had plunged her, she began to see that, after all, she was no more to be shielded from the consequences of evil-doing than other folks. She

actually found herself on a par with the Saunderses and other 'low' people, who had got themselves into trouble through being 'a little too fast.' And her husband had actually got himself into prison like any common debtor ! To think that one of the high and mighty Grettons should come to this !

Mrs. Gretton began to feel, too, what a treasure Geraldine was. Poverty made her look upon things with new eyes, and she now saw that Geraldine was indeed an excellent girl—brave, self-denying, forgiving, strong to do and suffer for those dear to her. Mrs. Gretton's manner became gracious, gentle, even kind towards her ; and this so inspired Geraldine with thankfulness, that, notwithstanding their discomforts, the disgrace attached to their name, and the fact of her father's being in prison, she was happier than she had ever felt in her life before since the careless days of childhood. For now they were no longer hypocrites, riding the high horse at the peril of those who regarded them at far more than their worth ; they were living in genuine honest style now, though in poverty and disgrace, which would be their lot many a weary year yet.

Digby suffered the most keenly of any of the family. He would have shared his father's fate, but for the fact of his being a minor. Now, however, he was just on the eve of his twenty-first year, and would henceforth be a responsible member of society. He found a far more comfortable home with the gentleman in whose service he was than Geraldine could have given him. But the young fellow fretted under his sense of poverty, not because it made him in some degree dependent upon others, but because it debarred him from those circles of society in which he had pre-eminently moved. It mortified him intensely to hear the whispered sneers of fast companions about his poor and disgraced condition, to have the cold shoulder turned upon him, to be shut out from those gay scenes in which he used to take so much delight, and to be denied those elegant little personal adornments which he deemed necessary to the make-up of a handsome young man of family.

The change of circumstances wrought in him no hatred of the extravagance that had brought them about—no manful determination to redeem the good name of the family by sturdy honesty and brave effort to become independent of those who despised toil and poverty. On the contrary, he fretted in a puny, sentimental spirit, and nothing but stern necessity would have made him deny himself any of those superfluities which he had been wont to indulge in. His unprincipled habits and notions were too deep-rooted to be

overturned by this storm of adversity, which he did not allow himself to feel only so far as it hurt his vanity.

His pecuniary wants harassed him beyond measure. ‘I will have money; I must have money,’ he would sometimes say, with criminal impatience and desire. No one would trust him with a shilling’s worth of anything now; of course it was not to be expected: and he could neither beg nor borrow of any of his former friends. The more honourable among them were disgusted with his want of principle; the less honourable did not deem him a desirable acquaintance, now he had no money.

Digby put forth his hand to evil against his kind employer and benefactor. He made a dazzling show as of old before his former companions, much to their surprise; but it was only for a brief time—like the blaze of a meteor, and was succeeded by deeper darkness than before. The darkness of a prison followed it; and this gay young man, whose dishonesty was unmistakably largely due to the direful training to which he had been subjected, this scion of the grand house of Gretton, found himself, at the age of twenty-two, utterly disgraced—condemned to five years’ penal servitude for robbing his employer. The verdict which many a tradesman in Highfly, smarting for the family’s former extravagance, pronounced upon the young man was, ‘Served him right.’

Meanwhile Geraldine was the only one of the family who had brought any prosperity and happiness to it as yet. She kept brave and busy, so that she might minister to the needs and comforts of her mother and the younger children. The next daughter, Alice, was now eighteen, and after considerable effort Geraldine succeeded in getting a situation as nursery governess for her. Alice had not Geraldine’s unselfish disposition, and she went to the situation, not with the hope of being able to lighten Geraldine’s burden in maintaining the family, but for the sake of getting a better home and seeing a little change.

Geraldine struggled on without thought of reward; but reward came as it always does, sooner or later, to those who walk in integrity, and labour for love. Mrs. Kepp regarded her not only as the instructor of her children, but as a dear friend; and she invited the young girl to make one in her happy family circle as often as Geraldine could possibly spare an evening. On these occasions she frequently met Mrs. Kepp’s brother, Mr. Verner, who was holding a superior post in one of the banks. Geraldine greatly enjoyed his society, and was gratified by his apparent enjoyment of hers; but she never permitted herself to think of him as anything but a

friend whom she esteemed and respected. She sometimes felt very deeply the pain of the stigma which attached to her name on her father's and brother's account ; and although no one could utter a word of reproach against herself, and she felt herself a lady in spite of her poverty and hard work, she never imagined that any one in Highfly would be willing to ally himself with her disgraced family, least of all a man of Mr. Verner's position and superior ideas. She did not even wish it.

'I can suffer what I have to bear very well alone,' she would sometimes say to herself ; 'but I could not bear the thought of having one whom I loved to suffer with me. It would be selfish in me to wish any gentleman to stoop to me and take part of my burden of shame upon his shoulders ; and I never could marry any but a gentleman.' It is not necessary for us to explain that Geraldine's idea of a gentleman was not the common one relating to money and position. Education, refinement, and goodness were her standards to measure men by.

It was precisely by the same standards that Mr. Verner measured women ; and he saw in Geraldine one whom he could feel proud to call his wife, notwithstanding her reduced status in society, her poverty, and the disgrace that had fallen upon her name. She was not mistaken in fancying that he enjoyed her society : he enjoyed it heartily, and he felt drawn towards her as not all the fascinations of the Highfly belles had ever succeeded in drawing him. This poor, little, brave girl of twenty-one, acting such a womanly part in the world, in a happy, self-renouncing spirit, and with staid independence, seemed to him as superior to the fashionable Highfly young ladies who patronised him with their smiles, and practised their arts upon him, as superior to them all as the violet is to flaunting poppies. Geraldine did not seek his love ; but he rejoiced to bestow it upon her freely and without reserve : and he felt honoured by her reciprocation of it.

It was revealed to her just at the right time. It was on the birthday of one of Mrs. Kepp's children, and a special gathering of young friends was held, to which the child would have Geraldine invited. Geraldine tried to be excused, for her youngest sister was ill, and she could scarcely bear the thought of leaving her at night, especially for a festive scene. But little Master Kepp, whose birthday it was, would take no denial. Geraldine was a particular favourite of his, and his party would be incomplete without her. So she went, upon the condition that she should be allowed to leave early. Of course dear uncle Verner was there, too, and when at nine

o'clock Miss Gretton wished the merry party good-bye, he volunteered to escort her home. Geraldine would almost rather have gone alone; for her heart was sick with anxiety for her darling little sister, and she looked at everything in life through the medium of that anxiety, and, consequently, saw everything miserably distorted. She felt that she could not talk to Mr. Verner. The night was lighted by a full moon, and though the way home was rather long, she had no girlish fears of walking it alone. She told Mr. Verner so, and earnestly begged him not to leave the party.

'If you have any objection to my going,' he began, 'perhaps—'

'Indeed,' interrupted Geraldine, 'it is purely on your own account that I wish you not to go.'

'If that is all, I may tell you that I'm afraid it is as much on my own account as yours that I wish to go,' he replied, drawing her gently through the hall, and taking her hand within his arm directly they got outside. 'I am exercising a friend's prerogative, you see, without so much as saying "By your leave,"' he said, with momentary gaiety.

'Yes, thank you,' said Geraldine, absently; 'pray don't keep a slow pace on my account,' she added, 'you don't know how fast I can walk when I like, and I do like this evening: I am so anxious to get home. I have been thinking of my little sister all the evening, and I am sure it kept me from making myself agreeable; but I really could not help it.'

'I could see you were troubled about something,' said Mr. Verner, kindly.

'Ah! I feared it could be seen,' responded Geraldine, 'I am so sorry. It is not often that I have so little control over my feelings; but to-night, in spite of the gaiety, everything seemed so dark to me. I feel to be losing some of the strength which has hitherto sustained me so well for what I have to do and bear. Possibly it is because I am a little over-tired: I did not get my sleep last night.'

'Poor child!' said Mr. Verner, taking the hand that lay so softly on his arm, and holding it in a firm pressure, 'I fear you are doing too much, and taking upon yourself more than you can bear. I often think of you with much concern. You must really take more care of yourself. I wish I could lighten you of some of those cares that press on you too heavily: could you not bring some of your troubles to me, and let me help you to bear them?'

The tone in which he spoke—so earnest and tender—almost brought tears to Geraldine's eyes; but she smiled at his request, and said, 'What could you do, Mr. Verner?'

'A great deal, dear Miss Gretton, if you would only give me the right.' Then he paused, and they took several steps in silence.

'Does it not lighten our care to have some one to share it,—some one to love us more than everybody else on earth, who will sympathise tenderly with us in every sorrow, and add to our joy when we are happy?'

'I should think so,' answered Geraldine, softly, 'though I have not had much experience of it since my good governess left us years ago; and I don't expect it in the years to come. Yet I should not say this,' she added, quickly, 'for dear mamma is now mindful of me; but I feel I ought not to speak of anything distressing to her.'

'Geraldine,' said Mr. Verner, in a very low voice, 'do you think you could ever come to regard me as that friend above all earthly friends who would have a right to make you an especial care, and give you such love as brightens the most gloomy lot? Let me say,' he added, rapidly, 'that whether you will take it or not, it is yours, and must be for ever.'

Geraldine looked up in his face; the moonlight was upon it, and she saw that it was earnest, and full of an eagerness which she had never observed in it before. She withdrew her eyes, and a deep blush overspread her face. Her feet felt unsteady, and she put her other hand on his arm, clasping it round, and leaned her head against his shoulder as they walked, with a momentary feeling of perfect rest and satisfaction. She felt too weary to be demonstrative in word or act,—to appear flurried or astonished. Yet she was astonished in a quiet way.

He paused a moment as she leaned against him, and said, anxiously, 'Are you ill?'

'No, no,' she replied, drawing him on, but making no other movement. There were no people near them, and she kept her head in its new resting-place.

'My darling!' he said, tenderly smoothing the soft face that leaned against him; 'is this an answer of consent to my question?'

'No, don't take it as such,' she replied, lifting her head; 'possibly you have not fully considered what you are doing, Mr. Verner, and I cannot allow you to commit yourself. Yet you are not wholly ignorant of the history of our past.'

'I know sufficient to make me sympathise most heartily with you, and more than that, dear Geraldine,—to make me esteem you above every woman I ever knew, and to love you with my whole heart. I want to know only one thing more to make me feel a happiness in your society that I have never yet enjoyed. Will you tell me,—answer me just one question?'

'If I can,' whispered Geraldine.

'You can,—you must,' he replied, with an earnestness almost vehement. 'Just this, dear Geraldine; you know something of me; we have been often together, and I have grown to love you very deeply: is this love mutual? Do you—can you ever—love me?'

All that Geraldine had been trying during the past year or two to consider pure friendship now showed itself to be what it really was,—love sweeter than life, stronger than death.

Again her head sank against his shoulder, and unwittingly holding his arm in a closer clasp, she said, very softly, 'May I confess it?'

'Yes do, darling.'

'Well, I think I have loved you ever since I knew you, Mr. Verner. I do love you. But,' she added, with a start, 'indeed we ought not to be talking thus. Many things imperatively forbid it.'

'Nothing shall forbid it, Geraldine. Nothing shall come between our love, my own darling,—mine from this hour, *God-given*, I am firmly persuaded; for I have asked you of Him, and He has blessed me with what I deem the most precious of His earthly gifts.'

And nothing was permitted to come between them, for though Geraldine showed him everything connected with herself and her family in the very worst light, to dissuade him from incurring any odium or unpleasantness by marrying her, still he was blind to everything but her own dear self. He knew her to be blameless and pure with regard to the family-doings; and 'I am not going to marry the whole family, Geraldine; but only you,' said he.

It was a great comfort to Geraldine to have such a friend during the remainder of the time that she had the responsibility of the family upon her. That was only about a year from the time that Mr. Verner claimed her as his future wife. Then Mr. Gretton was released from prison, and he returned to Highfly, a humbler and a wiser man. He was wishful to leave the town with his wife and the younger children, and, beginning life again in a simple, unostentatious way, resume his old work for their daily bread.

'No, papa,' urged Geraldine, 'stay here and vindicate your character. We have found many kind friends since you have been absent, and they have learnt to respect us just for what we are worth in ourselves. There are at least a dozen of my pupils that I am sure I can get transferred into your hands at once, and you will soon get more, and be able to have a nice

little house, and some new furniture ; and O, papa ! perhaps in time, by practising strict economy at home, you may be able to give some of your former creditors their due. It would take time, but I think you might be able to put some by, little by little, paying for everything as you go along, as we have been doing since we left our home. God would surely prosper and bless you in your efforts to do this ; and what a joy and comfort to the mind it would be to live honestly, if in ever such a poor way, and owe no man anything but love. Haven't we sinned enough against God and our fellow-men in keeping up appearances, and haven't we brought sufficient and terrible punishment upon ourselves ?'

'Indeed, yes,' said Mr. Gretton. 'In the silence of my prison I have seen ourselves in our true light. What sinful years of fraud and hypocrisy we spent ! We have reaped just as we sowed, and I freely admit that we have suffered most just retribution. We have been made to feel what we caused others to feel. But in the future, until my life's end, things shall be different. You, my good child, Geraldine, are the only one of the family who stood up for justice and right, yet you have suffered with the rest, and more than the rest, I fear. But now you are to be blessed with pure happiness and prosperity. This is as it should be, and I thank God for blessing you.'

Happier days than the family had ever before known now dawned upon them. They lived in poor and unpretending style, and Mrs. Gretton became so changed that she defied fashion as if she were a Quaker ; and they all confessed that whatever of show, fashion, and luxury they ignored for the sake of being honest and humble, seemed to be made up to them in solid comfort and happiness.

'Dear me !' said Mrs. Gretton, one day, as she bustled about getting tea, her husband sitting on a hard Windsor chair by the kitchen fire, happier than a king ; 'dear me, Bernard, to think what fools we were in the past years, struggling to keep up grand appearances at the sacrifice of peace of mind, honesty, happiness—everything that makes us now so contented and so respected in our simple, little home ! Depend upon it, Bernard, it is for our highest good and happiness that the Bible exhorts us to obey the commands, "Walk honestly," and "Owe no man anything."'

---

**STATISTICAL DATA FOR SOCIAL REFORMERS.**  
**No. II.**

**EXCISE RECEIPTS FROM INTOXICATING DRINKS.**

THE Commissioners of the Inland Revenue, in their Twelfth Report, lately issued, deal with the accounts of their department down only to the 31st of March, 1868. Surely a little more alacrity is possible, and it would, at all events, be very convenient for those who wish to verify, with the least avoidable delay, the fluxes and ebbings of the great commercial streams. It is of no use complaining, we suppose, that the Excise authorities group their statistics according to the Budget cycle, and not by the solar year; but, bearing this difference in mind, we may extract some useful information from the latest official missive of Somerset House. Between the gross and net receipts from every species of tax there is a considerable margin; but taking the net receipts of certain articles for the last ten years there is the following result (all the totals having respect to the *United Kingdom*) :—

From March 31,	To March 31,	British Spirits.	Malt.	Sugar used by Brewers.
1858	1859	£8,950,196	£5,412,777	.....
1859	1860	9,778,960	6,648,881	.....
1860	1861	9,225,538	6,208,813	.....
1861	1862	9,618,291	5,866,302	.....
1862	1863	9,399,707	5,389,909	.....
1863	1864	9,692,515	6,092,736	.....
1864	1865	10,176,731	6,394,553	£4,544
1865	1866	10,437,168	6,421,260	10,509
1866	1867	10,855,849	6,816,336	33,294
1867	1868	10,511,530	6,302,419	63,370

The hop duty ceased in 1862, and was replaced by an increased duty on brewers' licences. The above table conclusively shows that an increase of duty on spirits has been followed by an increase in the Excise receipts of upwards of a million sterling. The great question of the morality of taxation on articles whose common consumption is pernicious to the State, in a word, social poisons, has been hotly discussed. To impose a tax on such articles for the sake of raising a revenue from their use, is indisputably immoral; but to restrict their use by taxation is, so far, a national benefit. As the alternative of free trade in them, taxation is right; as the alternative of prohibition, it is wrong. Cowper, eighty years ago, saw and stigmatised the baseness of the apology summed up in the fact—"The Excise is fattened with the rich result of all this riot." The chief objections to this taxation—(1) that it gives a national sanction to a national curse; and (2) that it makes a department of the Government interested in sustaining a great abuse,—are strictly unanswerable; yet to abolish taxation, and so permit unrestricted production and sale, would lead to greater evils; and there is no escape from the difficulty but legislation (after due preparation of the public mind), which will prevent the influx of such money into the national exchequer, by permitting the exclusion of the national bane from the channels of commercial traffic and exchange.

**LICENCES ISSUED BY THE EXCISE.**

The licences of all kinds issued by the Excise in the year ending March 31, 1868, were 2,428,236; and the number of these connected with the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, with the amount of duty charged, was the following :—

	England.	Scotland.	Ireland.	U. Kngdm.	Duty chrgd. £.
Brewers .....	36,371	242	124	36,737	357,597
Dealers in beer .....	4,363	85	889	5,337	17,651
Do. additional licences to retail... .	2,441	...	749	3,190	3,516

	England.	Scotland.	Ireland.	U. Kingdom.	Duty chrgd. £
Dealers in spirits .....	4,574	403	502	5,479	57,530
Do. additional licences to retail... <td>2,510</td> <td>...</td> <td>...</td> <td>2,510</td> <td>7,901</td>	2,510	...	...	2,510	7,901
Dealers in wine .....	3,046	66	134	3,246	34,083
Retailers of beer (publicans).....	68,879	351	15,528	84,958	107,956
"    spirits " .....	67,638	12,013	15,223	94,934	616,214
"    wine " .....	32,359	4,487	5,590	42,436	93,699
"    beer and cyder (not publicans) .....	53,227	967	...	54,192	162,664
"    wine (to be consumed off the premises)...	2,424	1,991	134	4,545	10,471
"    beer, &c., on board packet boats .....	214	96	52	362	380
"    spirits (grocers) Irid.	...	...	387	387	4,140
Distillers and rectifiers .....	117	123	62	307	3,223
Malsters .....	5,087	464	145	5,696	15,885
Malt roasters and dealers in roasted malt .....	23	2	8	33	530
Refreshment houses .....	6,106	...	77	6,183	5,024
Do. selling wine.....	2,591	...	18	2,609	9,728
Sweets, makers and dealers .....	91	18	14	123	646
	292,121	21,513	39,636	353,270	£1,582,838

It must not be rashly inferred that these 353,270 licences represent that number of licencees or licensed shops. Many of the licencees hold two or three licences, and the number of liquor sellers, and of shops for sale, was stated in *Meliora* for April. The tea dealers of the United Kingdom numbered in the same year 177,712, of whom 72,914 resided in houses rated at less than £8 per annum. The produce of licences from this source was £69,591. The manufacturers of tobacco were 581, and the dealers in tobacco 279,716, whose fees amounted to £73,425. Under the head of 'tobacco,' in the Appendix, a table is given showing that the consumption of tobacco in this country continues to increase:—

Year.	Population of U. Kingdom.	Pounds weight cleared for consumption.	Average consumption per head, lb. oz.
1841	26,700,000	23,096,281	0 13 $\frac{1}{2}$
1851	27,347,000	27,734,786	1 0 $\frac{1}{2}$
1861	28,887,000	35,413,846	1 3 $\frac{1}{2}$
1867	30,145,000	41,053,612	1 5 $\frac{1}{2}$

That the consumption of tobacco has nearly doubled in twenty-six years is not an omen for good. Either the number of smokers has greatly increased, or the lovers of the pipe and cigar are now more ardently addicted to their use than they were in 1841; and more 'cloud-blowing,' whatever be the cause, will not tend to clear the intellects or sweeten the breath of the men who are, or are to be. Women have not yet taken to smoking as they did to snuffing in the last century; and who does not hope that this method of competing with the masculine gender, and of extending the domain of woman's rights, will long continue unused by the softer and (as to this particular practice) the wiser sex?

#### MAGISTERIAL REDUCTION OF LICENCES.

It may be laid down as axiomatic, that no reform of the licensing system which does not provide for a large reduction of licences can claim to answer to its name. There is an inveterate tendency among licensing magistrates to avoid interfering with 'rights of property,' though all the rights of civilisation are mercilessly sacrificed by the present system and its administration. If any one doubts the justice of this censure let him turn to a parliamentary return for the metropolitan district, printed in 1856, showing the number of new licences granted and the number of licences taken away in the years 1850-1-2-3-4-5. The number granted was 520; the number taken away (out of 6,000 public-houses) thirty-nine, of

which seventeen only were permanently forfeited. Can credulity the most extravagant imagine that in any five years only thirty-nine licences, out of 6,000, were legally rescindable for misconduct, contrary to their terms and tenure? And if the forfeiture was not enforced, who was to blame? A much more recent parliamentary return has been published, having reference to the years ending September 29th, 1866-7-8, and to the counties of Bedford, Buckingham, Cambridge (with the Isle of Ely), Essex, Hertford, Huntingdon, Leicester, Lincoln, Norfolk, Northampton, Oxford, Rutland, Salop, Stafford, Suffolk, Warwick, and Worcester. The population in 1861 is given (excluding the boroughs) as 3,545,267; the public-houses and beerhouses (on the three years' average) at 10,142 and 9,973. The houses proceeded against in the three years were 1,686 public-houses and 2,659 beershops, of which number 1,363 public-houses and 2,282 beershops were fined. These were not all distinct houses; no doubt many of them had been repeatedly fined; but this fact, while implicating fewer separate houses, renders more surprising the further fact, that in these three years only twenty-nine public-houses and five beershops were deprived of their licences, the aggregate cases of drunkenness proceeded against by the police were 27,338, of which 19,918 cases were subjected to fine and 3,054 committed for trial. The mockery of magisterial control which could permit so few licences to be forfeited is almost equalled by the mockery of police supervision which could take cognisance of a yearly average of only 9,129 cases of drunkenness as the collective outcome of a year's tippling in 20,115 drinking-houses, scores of which are denounced by the police and magistrates as centres and *foci* of all imaginable debauchery and crime. A similar return has been published as to thirty-four boroughs (Birmingham, Leicester, Norwich, Wolverhampton, Coventry, &c.), with a collective population of 990,092 in 1861. These boroughs had in the same three years (ending September 29th, 1866-7-8) an annual average of 4,582 public-houses and 3,112 beershops. During the three years 1,189 public-houses and 1,819 beershops were proceeded against, and 958 public-houses and 1,468 beershops were fined, yet the public-houses deprived of their licences were fifty-one and of the beerhouses one! In the three years there were 14,994 cases of drunkenness apprehended by the police, 7,698 followed by fine and 2,994 by committal; the yearly average being, respectively, cases 4,998, fines 2,566, committals 998.

#### DRUNKENNESS AND CRIME IN CONNECTION WITH BOROUGH PUBLIC-HOUSES AND BEERSHOPS.

A return obtained by Mr. Knatchbull-Hugesson, Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, furnishes various particulars as to the police condition of Bradford, Derby, Hull, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Nottingham, Salford, Sheffield, Stockport, and Sunderland. It is not easy to summarise a sheet bristling with figures, but we shall first of all give the totals (which are omitted from the return) under the various headings adopted:

Population of the cities and boroughs named, census of 1861.....	1,845,622
Number of indictable offences in the year ending September 30, 1868.....	16,190
Number of offences per 1,000 of the population .....	nearly 9
Number of persons apprehended for indictable offences .....	5,461
Number discharged for want of evidence.. .....	2,009
Number discharged for want of prosecution .....	771
Number committed for trial .....	2,681
Number of known thieves.....	2,540
Number of known thieves to 1,000 population .....	about $1\frac{1}{2}$
Number of licensed houses:—	
Public-houses.....	5,273
Beerhouses .....	6,447
	11,720
Number proceeded against:—	
Public-houses.....	553
Beerhouses .....	1,950
	2,503

Number convicted :—				
Public-houses.....	.....	.....	401	
Beerhouses .....	.....	.....	1,697	
		—		2,098
Number deprived of licence for misconduct :—				
Public-houses.....	.....	.....	19	
Beerhouses .....	.....	.....	9	
		—		28
Number of inhabitants to each licensed house, according to the census of 1861.....	.....	.....		157
Drunk, and drunk and disorderlies :—				
Number proceeded against .....	.....	.....	31,948	
Number convicted .....	.....	.....	23,712	
Number discharged .....	.....	.....	8,236	
Number proceeded against to 1,000 population .....	.....	about		17

Of course there are great inequalities in the relative proportions of different places. These may be exhibited by extracts from the return :—

	No. of indictable offences per 1,000 population.	No. of known theives to 1,000 population.	No. of inhabitants to each licensed house.	No. proceeded against as drunk, and drunk and disorderly per 1,000 population.
Bradford .....	2.89	1.045	193	2.683
Derby .....	1.74	1.671	125	6.081
Hull .....	2.13	1.02	191	9.727
Leeds .....	5.416	2.08	220	6.584
Liverpool.....	10.491	1.124	166	32.556
Manchester .....	22.964	2.098	132	28.195
Newcastle-on-Tyne.....	3.751	1.656	131	16.03
Nottingham .....	.966	1.596	162	2.401
Salford .....	9.139	1.318	156	6.219
Sheffield .....	2.63	0.653	132	5.519
Stockport .....	1.042	0.384	205	16.331
Sunderland .....	1.05	0.476	149	7.327

This table illustrates (what is often unjustly charged upon statistics as peculiar to them) the unreliabilities of comparisons where the conditions are diverse. It is well known that as to apprehensions for drunkenness, both the rule and practice differ greatly in different towns; and an anomaly presented by this table—the excess of indictable offences in Manchester over those in Liverpool—is explained by the circumstance, that in the Liverpool statistics a large class of offences are omitted, the addition of which would raise the proportion from 10.491 to 27.201 per thousand population. The Manchester return, if similarly treated, would only be raised from 22.964 to 28.745 per thousand, and would still leave out of sight the very important fact that the gravity of the indictable offences in Manchester is, in general, very much less than in the sister and sea-port town. For the reason above given, also, it needs not excite surprise that the proportions of indictable offences and of arrests for drunkenness, and drunk and disorderly conduct, to population, do not agree quantitatively with the number of drinking-shops. The number of drinking-houses is an element, but simply one element, in the power of the liquor-traffic for mischief. Size, attractiveness, and position are also elements very powerful for evil, and will often nullify the otherwise greater influence for evil which number would exert. What all evidence past and present abundantly proves, is (1) that drunkenness and crime of all kinds are everywhere mainly produced by the drink-traffic; and (2) that the drunkenness entered on the public sheet is but a fraction of the intemperance prevailing in drink-shops and disseminated by them. It will be observed that while 2,098 of these

public-houses and beershops were convicted of breaking the law, only twenty-eight were deprived of their licences for misconduct.

The following statistics extracted from a contemporary\* are of the profoundest interest and importance, and, unless their accuracy can be successfully impeached, deserve to command the serious attention of all our statesmen:—

#### WASTE OF THE NATION'S WEALTH EVERY YEAR BY INTOXICATING DRINKS.

##### I.—MONEY ANNUALLY SPENT IN INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

1. Ardent Spirits (29,413,153 gallons in 1868) .....	£30,253,605
2. Malt Liquors (24,903,696 barrels in 1868) .....	59,768,870
3. Foreign Wines (15,151,761 gallons in 1868) .....	11,363,805
4. British Wines, Cider, Perry, &c. (say) .....	1,500,000
	£102,886,280

##### II.—LOSS OF WEALTH ANNUALLY INCURRED IN THE PRODUCTION AND RETAILING OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

1. The land now devoted to the growth of barley and hops used in making intoxicating drinks, would produce food of the value of not less than .....	£13,000,000
2. In the manufacture of strong drink there is a loss of capital and labour, worth at least .....	15,000,000
3. The labour of the retailers of intoxicating drinks, and of their servants, numbering 500,000 or upwards, would be worth, at the low estimate of £50 each, per annum .....	25,000,000
	£53,000,000

##### III.—EXPENSES AND BURDENS ANNUALLY ARISING FROM THE USE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

1. Loss of labour and time to employers and workmen by drinking— estimated by the Parliamentary Committee of 1834 at .....	£50,000,000
2. Destruction of property on sea and land, and loss of property by theft and other crime, the result of drinking habits (say) .....	10,000,000
3. Public and private charges by pauperism, destitution, sickness, insanity, and premature death—traceable to the use of strong drink (at least) .....	10,000,000
4. Cost of police, prosecutions, courts of justice, support of crimi- nals, losses to jurors and witnesses;—taking the proportion of criminal cases due to drinking (at least) .....	3,000,000
	£73,000,000

Great and ignoble total of the yearly loss of wealth to the British  
nation by intoxicating drinks..... £228,886,280

##### WHAT COULD BE DONE WITH THE WEALTH ANNUALLY WASTED IN INTOXICATING DRINKS BY THE BRITISH NATION.

Wealth annually wasted .....	£228,886,280
Deduct as not available for general purposes.....	50,000,000

Available from annual loss .....

£178,886,280

This sum, if applied to the liquidation of the National Debt (which was £797,031,660 on March 31st, 1868), would effect this great undertaking in a little over four years, and thus save the country for ever the payment of the interest on the debt, which amounted in the year ending March 31st, 1868, to £26,571,750.

\* The Temperance Times and Permissive Bill Journal, April 15th. (Curtice and Co., 9, Bookseller's Row, Strand, London.)

Or, it would form a fund to buy up all the railways in the United Kingdom in less than three years; the nett receipts of which (in 1866 they were £19,352,681) could then be annually devoted to the public service.

Or, it would pay in ONE YEAR all the expenses of a complete drainage system, and a water supply for every large town in the kingdom; and by so doing lower the rate of mortality and raise the standard of health and comfort over the whole country for ever.

Or, if this enormous sum were ANNUALLY collected and appropriated, it would suffice to do as follows:—

1. It would compensate the Exchequer for the loss of the Revenue from Intoxicating Liquors.....	£23,000,000
2. It would pay the Interest of the National Debt .....	26,571,750
3. It would allow all the taxes on tea, coffee, sugar, and chocolate to be remitted, and ensure the people 'a free breakfast table'.....	9,000,000
4. It would assign to public works of utility, such as drainage, harbours, lighthouses, reclamation of waste lands, &c., &c. ....	50,000,000
5. It would appropriate for the purposes of a complete system of free public education, public libraries, schools of design, art establishments, &c. .....	25,000,000
6. It would allow for public parks, gardens, baths, gymnasia, and other means of health and recreation .....	5,000,000
7. It would permit as grants for the relief of destitution and sickness, (under judicious management without demoralising the recipients) .....	10,000,000
8. It would assign for the gradual re-building and improvement of villages, towns, and cities .....	25,000,000
Unappropriated.....	173,571,750
	5,314,530
	<hr/>
	£178,886,280

NOTE.—All this expenditure being ANNUAL, and much of it re-productive, the ANNUAL SURPLUS could go to form a great National Reserve Fund available for purposes of social advancement and defence.

Can the correctness of these calculations be veraciously assailed? The attributed waste of wealth is classed under three divisions, the last of which may be considered exceedingly moderate, and the two others are unassailable unless on the theory that the use of intoxicating beverages is of some substantial value to mankind. Even those who contend for the affirmative, would generally allow that there is an abuse of such liquors extending to one-half or two-thirds of the quantity consumed; so that, by that amount, the wealth expended on their production and purchase is admitted to be wasted. It is no objection to these calculations to say that the money so spent goes to the creation of certain forms of industrial operation, and thereby to the support of a certain portion of the population: for if the operations are not productive of wealth (or what is for the weal of society), all that is done is so much loss of productive power, and all money spent in the articles produced is paid for nothing, the only useful result being that so many people (employed in the traffic) are fed, clothed, &c., at the expense of the nation. It will be observed that the author of these statistics assigns £50,000,000 as an equivalent for the wealth thus absorbed, and takes only a balance of £178,886,280 as wealth capable of being applicable to purposes of the greatest social usefulness and worth. The general deduction—one very humbling to our pretensions as an enlightened people—is, that we waste in alcoholic liquors, year after year, an amount of available resources sufficient to make us the happiest and most prosperous nation beneath the sun.

## S E L E C T I O N S .

## DINING HALLS.

A MEETING which took place recently, under the presidency of the Earl of Shaftesbury, will give a great impetus in the metropolis to the movement which has for its object the establishment of places of refreshment for the working classes, with all the advantages and none of the evils incidental to public-houses. For some years past, in various parts of the country, a trial of such places has been made, and wonderful unanimity prevails as to the success of the experiments. In Shrewsbury, for example, a building was erected at a cost of £4,000, containing dining, recreation, and reading-rooms. An additional sum of £200 was spent in enlarging the premises, which was recouped in the course of two years and a half from the profits of the undertaking. No less a number than 2,000 meals, of an unexceptionable kind, are provided at a reasonable rate each week, and so eagerly do the workpeople in the town, as well as the agriculturists who visit it on market day, avail themselves of the advantages thus offered, that arrangements are about to be made to increase the size of the building. In the course of five years, 1,000 persons using the refreshment-room have entered their names in a temperance pledge-book kept on the premises. A kindred institution is that known as the Westminster Club. It differs, however, in this respect, that none but members who pay 4d. per week can participate in its benefits. The present number of members is 27,478, and the library contains between 200 and 300 volumes. At Aldershot a club-house was erected in 1863, involving an outlay of £6,000. Within the walls of the building are coffee, smoking, and reading-rooms, and a lecture hall capable of seating 700 persons. The little town of Market Lavington, with a population of 1,500, is in happy possession of one of the most successful of these working men's clubs. The structure in which its operations are carried on is admirably planned, containing within its area a coffee-room—which, the report of last year states, was so well patronised, that it would not have been too

large if it had been three times its present size—lecture, smoking, reading, and recreation rooms. Every department of the institution pays its own way. At Tunbridge Wells the refreshment department was originally in the hands of a committee, but at the end of four years it was made over to a manager, who can now boast that the receipts for the provisions supplied have risen from £600 to £1,200 per annum. The Eastbourne Institution, which at the outset cost £3,000, and has lately been much enlarged, is in advance of most of the others in this respect—that it has dormitories attached to it. Shaftesbury Hall, Prince's-road, Notting-hill, London, has been opened about two years, its promoters being anxious to give to the working classes a public-house, *minus* intoxicating drinks. They have, therefore, so arranged it, that, in addition to the bar, where artisans can obtain all they may require in the way of refreshment, they can carry on the various organisations which are inseparably connected with their position and pursuits. Thus loan societies, benefit societies, and discussion classes are all held on the premises, being managed by the working men themselves. Lectures and entertainments are also provided, and opportunities afforded for moral and religious instruction. When first the public-house was opened, the supply of refreshments was limited to tea and coffee, but at the present time anything that is requisite for the working man in the way of food, and drinks not intoxicating, may be obtained between five in the morning and eleven at night. The catering department is under the direction of an efficient manager, who undertakes it on his own responsibility, paying a certain weekly sum for the premises. About £22 per week are received from the sale of refreshments. It was at Shaftesbury Hall that the meeting took place, and the proceedings were rendered specially interesting by the presence and speech of Mr. Corbett, whose efforts in Glasgow in providing cheap refreshment-rooms have acquired wide and deserved reputation. Mr. Corbett stated that he was

led to engage in the enterprise from the conviction that, except in places where they were exposed to the temptations incidental to drink, there were no convenient and comfortable houses of resort where the working classes could obtain cheap and wholesome food. Looking carefully at the question of provisions, he came to the conclusion that the real cost of a cup of tea, a bowl of soup, or an egg, was about 3d. each, and thereupon determined to establish the principle of penny rations. Having taken a suitable hall in Glasgow, he fitted it up in a way that would render it attractive. No sooner was the hall thrown open, than it was found that the public would eagerly avail themselves of the advantages which it offered, and, in the course of a very short experience, it proved to be entirely self-supporting. He was desirous that it should be understood that while he had gone into the matter from philanthropic motives, he determined to carry it out upon strictly self-supporting principles. He had looked at it from first to last in a commercial light. When the working men and others entered the rooms for refreshment, they did not feel that they were the subjects of patronage, but were perfectly independent. The first hall he had opened having proved so successful, the plan was extended, and at the present time there were twenty-five of these places in full working order in the city of Glasgow. What he had done was this. Taking a map of the city, he had fixed upon the spots where he thought such establishments were most required, and then he had opened them, and the result had been that a gross profit of £10,000 or £11,000 had been obtained. The expenses of the refreshment halls were about £8,000, which gave a net profit of about £2,000 per annum, a profit as net as any obtained from any of the business transactions in which commercial men were engaged. As to the provisions supplied at the refreshment-rooms, they were of the best quality, though they were simply cooked. This latter plan was adopted, as it was thought that if the food was disguised by the artifices of cookery it might be regarded with a suspicious eye by the working classes. From a paper containing some statistics, he found that 44,800 bowls of porridge, 58,32 cups of coffee, 75,00 cups of tea, 21,594 slices of bread and butter,

27,600 eggs, 148,016 plates of beef, 225,344 plates of potatoes, 99,344 basins of soup, and 135,000 plum puddings, were consumed in the course of a month. The reasons why halls such as he had established in Glasgow were not sometimes successful were, that they were placed in the wrong localities, or were built in the wrong way. His own idea had always been to have comfortable, well-lighted, and well-ventilated rooms, about 100 feet long by 40 feet wide, lighted from the roof, and some 30 feet in height. He thought he might say of the rooms in Glasgow, that they were as well lighted, as well warmed, and as airy as any of those in which gentlemen were in the habit of taking their dinners. Referring again to the secret of the non-success of similar rooms elsewhere, Mr. Corbett expressed the belief that it arose from the want of unity of management. In order to carry out the principle properly, there should be one directing head. Where that was obtainable they would be sure to answer commercially. In his own case he had been repaid the whole of the capital he had laid out, with the exception of investments in the buildings, and had made a profit of about £7,000, which, in accordance with a resolution he had formed, he had handed over to various charitable purposes. Without entering into details, he might say that the kitchen of his establishment covered an area of a quarter of an acre in extent, and that the milk of 120 cows daily was taken for their use. There needed to be no doubt whatever that in London such rooms would prove eminently successful. The metropolis was specially fitted for such an undertaking, but it ought to be carried out in some other way than through the medium of committees, which, as a rule, were weak, and not adapted for such work. As the great difficulty in London in the way of establishing these refreshment places would be obtaining suitable halls, he would suggest that a committee should be got together for the purpose of providing these. Let the committee provide the buildings, and then let them place the refreshment department in the hands of energetic and competent managers, who would have it under their own control, and would find it to their advantage to conduct it efficiently. He specially commended this view to the attention of the

Earl of Shaftesbury, and would be delighted to find that his lordship took it up. At the conclusion of Mr. Corbett's speech, a committee such as he had suggested was appointed, the

Earl of Shaftesbury expressing his full concurrence in the movement which had been the subject of consideration.—*Western Morning News.*

#### AN ENGLISH PHOTOGRAPH, BY AN AMERICAN.

**CUSTOM** may blind the eyes and deafen the ears of Englishmen to the sights and sounds of vice among women that startle the foreigner at every turn; but this monster—Custom—is a part of the ill-treatment of Englishwomen. No man has a right to accustom himself to crime. Custom permits women to drink gin at public-houses in the most frequented streets. Custom admits women, unattended, to the upper galleries of all the theatres. Custom permits prostitutes to take entire possession of the Haymarket and its vicinity after ten o'clock at night. Custom opens dance-houses and promenadeconcerts for the express accommodation of prostitutes, although the authorities who license them know that they are simply places of assignation. Custom sets apart certain districts of London for the residences of lewd women. Custom keeps open night-houses, in order that prostitutes may be able to get drunk after the regular taverns have closed at midnight. Custom is responsible for all this; but Englishmen are responsible for the custom. The police and the magistrates are powerless to suppress many acknowledged haunts of vice in England, because there is no public opinion to sustain them. Nay—as public opinion cannot be neutral, it tacitly declares itself in favour of vice, and forces the police and the magistrates to aid and abet the very institutions they were created to annihilate. In other countries, crime hides itself from the eyes of the policeman, and trembles at the very name of a magistrate. In England, it puts itself under the protection of the law, and transforms the law's officials into its own agents and instruments. The police mount guard, in order that nobody may interfere with the criminal; and the magistrates actually assist him to collect his infamous dues from his victims.

Hogarth never painted, nor Dickens

described, worse scenes than those enacted in the licensed night-houses. One morning, I recollect, long after the legal hour for closing the establishment, the police visited a night-house near Leicester Square. The house is arranged with a neat little shop—in which nothing is ever sold—opening on to the street. Passing through the shop, you go up-stairs, and find yourself in a small room, furnished in a light Parisian style, and with a large table in the centre. Around the table, on the night in question, were a dozen courtesans and as many of their admirers, laughing, drinking, singing, shouting, and bandying coarse jokes. A young lord, with more money than sense, was calling for bottles of 'fizz'—slang for champagne—and giving his I O U to the bar-tender for the amount. Suddenly there came a knock at the baize door, and the porter was heard to call—'Be still a moment, please, ladies; here's the police.' I happened to be waiting on the stairway for a friend, and saw the whole *modus operandi*. 'Who is it?' asked the landlord. The porter mentioned the policeman's name. 'Take him a glass of sherry; that's all right,' was the response. The fun and noise went on. Half-an-hour afterwards, there was another knock, another inquiry, another name. 'Here, Mary, you must go down to him,' said the landlord. The riot and rampage were louder than ever. Another knock: three policemen this time; the thing was growing more serious. The drinking-room was thrown open, and the three policemen marched in. The courtesans had vanished through another door, but betrayed their presence not less by their giggling and talking, than by the muffs, cloaks, and gloves they had left in the room. Their admirers were sitting quietly around the table, smoking peacefully. 'Lodgers?' asked one of the policemen.

'Certainly, sir,' replied the landlord. The women tittered loudly. 'Good night,' said the policeman, and the three guardians of the peace marched gravely away. This, drawn from life, is a night inspection by the Haymarket

police in 1868. Justice is said to be blind; but are her representatives deaf as well? If so, how much did it cost to blind and deafen them?—*English Photographs by an American*. London: Tinsley Brothers.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

*Report by the Committee on Intemperance for the Lower House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. Printed and circulated by order of the Lower House, with copious Appendix.* London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

This is by far the most valuable Report on Intemperance that has appeared for many years. In some respects its importance is unique. Considering its source,—the Lower House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury,—and the class of readers to whom it especially appeals, it is the first and only thing of its kind. And apart from its origin and destination, it is replete with the results of a most thorough examination by circular, of witnesses, including not only the parochial clergy of the province, but also the judges, police magistrates, recorders, and coroners of England and Wales, the superintendents of lunatic asylums, the governors and chaplains of prisons, heads of the constabulary throughout Great Britain, and the masters of workhouses throughout England and Wales; from all of which classes copious answers to questions have been returned, showing the extent, causes, results, and desired remedies of intemperance. Of these answers abundant selections have been made, and are printed in the appendix to the Report; they present, we are assured, a fair and impartial sample of the whole, afforded by witnesses entitled to be heard on the subject, with which from their respective positions they must be necessarily so fully acquainted as to give authority to their statements.

It is impossible in a brief notice to give any adequate notion of the varied contents of this most instructive and invaluable volume. In a subsequent

number of *Meliora*, we shall supply copious details drawn from this source; at present we can only indicate the course taken by the inquiry as developed in this Report and Appendix. Of the age at which intemperance begins, we have the evidence of clergymen and governors of workhouses; of the beer-shops as causing intemperance, that of clergy, chief constables and superintendents of police, governors of workhouses, and coroners; of the causative action of all public facilities for drinking, that of clergy, governors and chaplains of prisons, chief constables and superintendents of police, an asylum superintendent, and governors of workhouses; of samples of disproportion of public-houses, etc., to population, that of clergy, recorders, chief constables and superintendents of police; of the evil of paying wages at public-houses, that of clergy and a workhouse chaplain; of the part payment of wages in drink, that of clergy, coroner, landowner, and governors of workhouses; of the meeting of clubs at public-houses, that of clergy, recorder, superintendent of asylum, and governors of workhouses; and of statutes, mops, etc., that of clergy, chief constables and superintendents of police, and governors of workhouses. Further on, clergy, coroners, and recorder give testimony on the adulteration of liquor; clergy on police corruption; clergy and governor of workhouse on the effect of intemperance on the work of the Church; judges, magistrates, recorders, clergy, governors of workhouses, governors and chaplains of prisons, and chief constables and superintendents of police on intemperance and crime; clergy, superintendents of asylums, and coroners on disease, lunacy, and sacrifice of life; clergy, superintendents of asylums,

and governors of workhouses on the unwise prescription of alcohol as medicine; governors and chaplains of prisons and workhouses on the benefit of withdrawing intoxicating liquors; and Sir C. Trevelyan and Sir John Bowring on the obstruction to the gospel by intemperance. Besides all this evidence, we have more by clergy, recorders, magistrates, coroners, superintendents of asylums, governors of workhouses and prisons, chief constables and superintendents of police on general and particular remedies for intemperance, including asylums for inebriates, cottage allotments, coffee rooms, penny readings, improved dwellings, education, special teaching of laws of health, training of females in domestic duties, temperance societies, bands of hope and total abstinence, Sunday closing, early closing, reduction in number of public houses, change of licensing authority, enforcement of penalties, special inspection, and detection of adulteration, *popular restraint on the issue of licenses, and good effects of having no public-house or beershop.* Lastly, there is given a list of parishes in the province of Canterbury in which no public-house or beershop exists;—a list, we must say, of surprising length. The whole of the evidence thus given in a volume of 238 pages is carefully and methodically arranged; and it is preceded by the report of the Committee of Convocation, which, under the able and most laborious, arduous, and self-denying chairmanship of the Ven. Archdeacon Sandford, undertook, carried out, and now causes to be published the results of this remarkable and most instructive inquiry.

*A Narrative of the Cruelties Inflicted upon Friends of North Carolina Yearly Meeting during the Years 1861 to 1865, in consequence of their Faithfulness to the Christian view of the Unlawfulness of War.* Published by order of the Representatives of North Carolina Yearly Meeting of Friends. With a few Introductory Remarks by Joseph Crosfield. London: Edward Newman, 9, Devonshire-street, Bishopsgate.

THAT the days of heroism are not all gone by; that fidelity to what is believed to be Christian principle can still stiffen the back, nerve the breast to bear, and defy all the tortures that can

be inflicted, the pamphlet before us gives abundant proof, if proof is required. It shows, too, that the Society of Friends still remains true to its ancient testimony concerning the unlawfulness of war. It is a lovely doctrine,—this of non-resistance to evil,—if we did but live in a world where it could be consistently adopted. But, in principle, international war and civil war are the same; and (leaving war international out of the reckoning) how we are to exist in this world without civil war we hold to be an unsolved problem. The whole difficulty would be abolished, if murderers, burglars, and all other workers of criminal iniquity, would but respect the peace principle, and have some regard for the welfare of society. This, however, they decline to do; hence the necessity for a police force. Now there are two things to be remarked in a police force;—first, the police; and second, the force. If we could have the police without the force, the peace-principle, in civil life, could be established; but as the force is indispensable, and the police, in the last resort, would be useless without it, the peace-principle goes to the wall. For force—disguise it by what name we may—means war, and nothing short of it. The policeman implies the truncheon, and if one policeman and one truncheon be not sufficient, then two, a dozen, or a score; and if these fail, then must come in the red-coated policeman, the man of the rifle, the bayonet, and the sword. The soldier being thus, in fact, a policeman; and the policeman being in his turn a soldier in a blue coat, and his function that of waging war against the disturbers and enemies of civil society,—as that of the soldier, rightly considered, is to take into custody or to put in a place or state of safety to society the international foes of moral law and order, where is the consistency of renouncing the red coat whilst accepting the blue? Admit that the magistrate is not to use the sword under any circumstances, then, indeed, the peace-principle is saved, but at the expense of the very existence of society. Allow that the magistrate doth not and ought not to wear the sword in vain, and what becomes of the peace-principle? If it be lawful to use whatever force is necessary to fend off a murderer from one's wife or family, it cannot

be unlawful to use whatever force may be necessary to keep off a thousand or a hundred thousand. In both cases the principle is the same. He, therefore, who holds that war is unlawful, must show how civil society is possible without a police force; how harmless people can escape slavery or worse, whilst murderers, depredators, and evil-doers of all kinds are allowed to work their will with impunity. And the Christian who believes that civil society without police protection, or in principle what amounts to it, is impossible, must conclude, of course, that whatever be the precepts of Christ which in their literal sense appear to prescribe entire non-resistance, this, at any rate, must be an exaggeration of their real meaning. To the good people of whom the pamphlet before us speaks, no such consideration would appear to have presented itself. "The Christian view of the unlawfulness of war" has been taken for granted; and what has remained, of course, has simply been, to carry it out in all honesty and fidelity. And for this we pay the honour that honesty and fidelity to principle must always receive, even when these are to some extent combined with inadequacy of observation and reflection. The peace-principle is in itself so lovely,—it brings with it such airs from heaven,—it breathes so consentaneously with all that is most saintly and angelical, that we cannot withhold from it our admiration and reverence, whilst we sigh to know that in this world at present it is not entirely and consistently practical. Towards its full realisation all true civilisation must constantly be tending. May the time speedily come when it will be susceptible of a much more thorough embodiment in institutions and customs than, unhappily, it is now.

Apart from the peace-principle, much respect is due to the assertion of the right to choose one's side in a war, and again, of the right to be consulted as to whether one will or will not devote one's-self to the occupation of a soldier on either side. In times of supreme need, authorities assume the right to press all men into the service; and if a man chooses to stand on his individual right to decide whether or not he will apply his energies in soldiering, and is willing to abide by all the consequences of his decision, we may both admire his courage and respect his principle of

inaction. From this point of view, the resistance so stoutly and bravely offered to enlistment by the 'Friends' in the Southern States during the late civil war, may be rejoiced in by many who fail to see the practicability of the full peace-principle. And although the narratives given in the pamphlet before us are artistically and baldly framed, they suffice to enable us to discern the existence and ability of a heroism in many cases that really deserves to be called magnificent.

In his introductory remarks, Joseph Crosfield observes that 'since the rebellion in Ireland there has been nothing which can be compared to the faithfulness of these Friends in the Southern States. In Germany some of the Friends have undergone severe personal suffering, and in Norway also several young men have been repeatedly imprisoned because they would not violate their consciences by taking up arms; but the state of things revealed to us in this narrative is on a larger scale, and shows a whole community firmly yet meekly resisting what they felt to be unlawful for them as Christian men to comply with, and patiently abiding the consequences.'

Our readers will like to see the following extracts from this very interesting 'Narrative':—

"In the spring of 1865 about forty men professing to be in search of conscripts, came to a mill belonging to J. D., of Cane Creek, Chatham Co. The miller was first hung up by a rope three times to force him to betray his sons, who were hidden. Upon hearing the screams of the miller's wife and children, J. D. went out to the crowd. The same information was demanded of him, but he assured them of his entire ignorance as to their retreat. He was at once seized and carried into the barn. A rope was tied around his neck, and thrown over a beam, while he was mounted upon a box. Then beginning to tighten the rope, they said, "You are a Quaker, and your people, by refusing to fight and keeping so many out of the army, have caused the defeat of the South," adding, that if he had any prayers to offer, he must be quick, as he had only five minutes to live. J. D. only replied that he was innocent, and could adopt the language, "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do." They then said they would not

hang him just then, but proceeded to rob him; then ordered him under a horse-trough, threatening to shoot him if he looked up. While lying there he could hear them hanging up the miller three different times till the sound of strangling began. After finally extorting a promise from him to find his sons they left, charging J. D. to lie still till they came back with some others to hang. They did not return, however, but went on to one of his Methodist neighbours, whom they hung until unconscious, and then left him in that state; and the next night they found one of the missing conscripts, whom they hung until dead. Such were the persecutions at the hands of violent men, of which many instances could be given.'

'J. G., of —— Co., was conscripted in the autumn of 1862. About two months before this his fear of the coming evil was so great that he left his home and family, and escaped to Tennessee. But finding that the step did not result in peace of mind, he returned and quietly awaited the result. In about two weeks he was arrested and carried to Camp Holmes. In a few days the conscripts were all summoned and offered bounty money if they would now volunteer. J. G. and two others refused the offer. An attempt was next made to entrap them by giving them a paper to sign, without which they were assured they could have neither money nor clothing. They were adroitly told of the great need they might soon have of the latter, or if not needing it themselves, of the good they might do in giving it to the needy. These offers were steadily refused, and the wily arguments met by the open assertion that "all war was opposed to the whole spirit and teachings of the Gospel and the mission of the Christian. His weapons, they said, were not to be carnal but spiritual." Bundles of clothing were, however, soon tossed to them, with many offensive epithets, and they were now told that they must either obey orders or be shot; and that if they did not fire when in battle the men behind were ordered to shoot them. J. G. replied, "You have me here, and may inflict on me any punishment you will; but I cannot do more than submit to what you inflict. My hands are clean of the blood of men, and I intend to keep them so, cost what it may."

'An attempt was then made to force the bounty money upon them, but in vain. One of the officers now came forward and said, "Boys, I want to give you some good advice. Take your clothing and money and go along. Obey your officers and do right, or else you will be put under sharp officers of Col. S., who will have you shot into strings if you don't obey. Just put away your Quaker notions now and do right. What regiment will you be sent to?" Refusing to commit himself by any choice, he was ordered to Richmond, Va.; but while on his way he, with several others, was released through the efforts of Friends, and the payment of the five hundred dollars required.'

'S. F., who had become a member with us after the passage of the Exemption Act, and could not avail himself of it, was arrested in the Twelfth Month, 1864, and taken to Salisbury. On refusing to take a gun he was subjected for two hours to the brutal punishment known as bucking, in which the person is placed in a stooping position, the wrists firmly tied and brought in front of the knees, with a pole thrust between the elbows and the knees, thus keeping the body in a painful and totally helpless position. After this he is made to carry a pole for two or three hours, and then tied during the night. The next morning he was tied up by the hands for two hours. The same afternoon a gun was tied to his right arm and a piece of timber to his neck. Unable longer to endure the weight of it, he sat down in order to support the end of it upon the ground, when he was pierced by a bayonet. They then bucked him down again, and gagged him with a bayonet for the remainder of the day. Enraged at the meekness with which these cruelties and indignities were borne, the captain began to swear at him, telling him it was useless to contend further; he must now take a gun or die. As the captain proceeded to tie the gun upon his arm, S. F. answered quietly, "If it is thy duty to inflict this punishment upon me do it cheerfully—don't get angry about it." The captain then left him, saying to his men, "If any of you can make him fight, do it—I cannot." Two young men now appeared with their guns, telling him they were going to take him off and shoot him. "It is the Sabbath," he replied, "and as good a day to die

as any." They, however, took him to the colonel of the regiment, who, more inclined to mercy, advised him to consult a lawyer and procure exemption, if possible, but assured him that if not so released he must take his gun or die. Two days after his gun was tied to his arm with great severity, and a strap passed around his neck, by which he was dragged around nearly the entire day. The next day the bucking was resorted to. A Friend, who visited the camp at this time, remonstrating against such cruelty, it was given up, though he was still retained as a prisoner till the surrender of Salisbury, not long after, restored him to his family.'

"S. W. L., of Randolph Co., N.C., was another of the number who proved faithful unto death. He had been a member of our religious society but a few months when he was arrested as a conscript and sent to the camp near Pittsburgh, Va. Upon his arrival he was ordered to take up arms. This he refused to do, and as a punishment was kept from sleep for thirty-six hours. As this did not move him, for about a week after he was daily bucked down for some length of time, and then suspended by the thumbs for an hour and a half. Being still firm in his refusal to fight, he was court-martialed and ordered to be shot. A little scaffold was prepared, on which he was placed, and the men were drawn up in line ready to execute the sentence, when he prayed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Upon hearing this they lowered their guns, and he was thrust into prison. Not long after he was sent to Winder Hospital, at Richmond, Va., where, after a long and suffering illness, the end came in his peaceful release for a mansion in heaven. A few lines from an officer in the regiment to which he had been assigned closed the suspense of an afflicted family, when his widow and his seven children were left with little other legacy than the like precious faith. "It is my painful duty to inform you that S.W.L. died in Winder Hospital, at Richmond, on the 8th of December, 1864. He died, as he had lived, a true, humble, and devoted Christian, true to his faith and religion. . . . We pitied him and sympathised with him; . . . but he is rewarded for his fidelity and is at rest."

*The Laws of Vital Force in Health and Disease; or, the True Basis of Medical Science.* By E. Haughton, A.B., M.D., M.R.C.S.E., &c. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, pp. 88. London: John Churchill and Sons, New Burlington-street.

The author has collected, revised, and re-published, in this little volume, several articles that have formed part of The London Medical Review, The Journal of Health, or The Medical Mirror, and to these has added other material, all tending to explain and illustrate what he deems to have been when he first stated it, a new theory of medicinal action. He holds, firstly, that the nervous system is the chief agent in the production and cure of diseases. He next enunciates the dictum that health is three-fold in its essential characteristics, and that hence disease is so likewise; consequently, that every form of morbid action is referable to one single type. He names, as the primary essentials of health, 'sufficiency of working power,' 'regularity in the rate of its evolution,' and 'proportionate distribution of the same to the various organs of the body.' On the other hand, disease consists in aberration from this condition of the vital force, either in respect of quantity, proportion, or time, thus giving rise to 'diminished vitality,' 'disturbed nervous equilibrium,' and 'functional irregularity,' and originating all these whenever there is any departure from the healthy standard in any one respect. The chief efforts of the physician should in every case, he says, be directed to increase general vitality, to restore nervous equilibrium, and to regulate periodic action. Such are the cardinal points of the author's theory, and to these he adds some very sensible accessories; as, that the enormous value of hygiene should be more fully insisted on than has hitherto been usual; that constant and needless interference with nature is adverse to recovery and cannot be too much deprecated, as tending to defraud the patient and degrade the physician; that no class of remedies should be neglected for which there is the testimony of educated and intelligent observers, but that each practitioner should be left free to use whatever means he may judge most fit. How far the author's theory (that the

whole art of curing diseases consists in increasing the working power of the human machine, and restoring the equality and regularity of its action) is what it appears at first sight,—nothing more than a somewhat vague and unfruitful generalisation, having no visibly useful bearing on medical practice, we must leave the medical profession now or hereafter to decide. We are glad to find the author affirming that 'whilst alcohol, when given as a palliative, acts isopathically in *delirium tremens*, antipathically in exhaustion, and allopathically in dyspepsia' [always supposing these three statements to be strictly correct], yet that none of these actions represent any increase of vital power. With regard to the action of alcohol in cases of exhaustion, he observes that 'it is true we may rouse the powers which exist in the body by alcoholic stimulation, but every sign of life which is thus elicited leaves in the body just so much less vitality than it had before, unless advantage is taken of the temporarily-increased evolution of vital force by the application of other remedies, or the alteration of surrounding conditions.'

*Minnie's Mission : An Australian Temperance Tale.* By Maud Jean Franc. Pp. 296. London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston, Crown Buildings, 188, Fleet-street.

So long as intemperance continues to desolate families, so long will temperance tales continue to be written, and have a claim to be circulated and read. Whether the supply is in excess of the demand, as tested by the booksellers' balance sheets, we cannot authoritatively state; but it appears to be a perpetually increasing quantity, and this indicates at least that an ever-increasing number of thoughtful minds are being impressed afresh with the evils of strong drink, and are desirous to contribute their earnest 'contingents to the great army of suasion. The writer of 'Minnie's Mission' is a lady who appears to have lived for some years in Australia, and to have become profoundly touched by the miseries superinduced by drinking customs on colonial life. And she has written this volume in order to reveal those miseries, and to show, first, what needs to be attempted, and, second, what may be accomplished, by all who agree with her in deplored their existence.

Minnie is a young immigrant who in the course of events is consigned to Australia, and being adopted cordially into the family of an uncle near Adelaide, finds and accepts a temperance mission amongst them, full of difficulty in the outset, but ending at last in a complete success, making itself evident just when a sudden attack of disease carries off the amiable and faithful missionary. The story is simply told, without any great display of literary skill, but in an earnest and thoroughly Christian spirit, and will make itself acceptable to all who love this qualification. Glimpses of Australian scenery and life give a pleasant local colouring to the tale. The volume is neatly printed on good paper and handsomely bound in cloth.

*The Hydropathic Record and Medical Free Press; Devoted to the Advocacy of Hydropathy, Hygiene, and Neurotherapie.* Malvern: Advertiser Office. London: Heywood and Co., Strand.

SEVERAL numbers of this new medical journal have been forwarded to us. In that for May, we find an article on the Permissive Bill. 'There can no longer be any doubt,' the author says, 'that the United Kingdom Alliance is a power in the country, which our whisky-drinking and beer-manufacturing senators would do well to pay attention to. All that is asked is that one neighbourhood shall not have the power of forcing intemperance upon another—a request so reasonable that we cannot for a moment contemplate its final rejection by the representatives of the nation. It would be just as easy to stop the advance of the tide as to prevent this measure, or some modification of it, from becoming the law of the land. We have but little sympathy with those who would not sacrifice some social enjoyment to promote such an object; but, in good truth, there is no sacrifice in the matter. After this measure passes, many a family, which was always in pecuniary difficulties, will taste the blessings of independence. Many a home, which insanity, vice, or shame used to darken, will be full of joyous faces, and brightened with the light of heavenly truth, before unheeded; whilst there is no individual in the community who will not be a gainer by the almost total absence of street brawls and of the disgusting

and blasphemous language which, under the present system, one cannot help hearing shouted aloud in the public thoroughfares of almost every great centre of civilisation.

'Oh! sisters and brothers dear:  
Oh! husbands, and mothers, and wives,  
It is not right to call "good cheer."  
What costs eternal lives!

To make a long argument short, the Permissive Bill will not diminish liberty in any locality which has not felt and pronounced it to be urgently necessary; nor will the people of any neighbourhood desire to perpetuate its operation, when the conditions which called for it have finally passed away.'

*Bible Exercises for the Family Reading, for the Cottage Meeting, and the Temperance Bible Class.* By Mrs. Lucas-Shadwell. London: W. Tweedie, 337, Strand.

The publisher, in his advertisement to the work, remarks that he feels assured that it will be a great help to many who are engaged in leading members of Temperance Societies to a fuller knowledge of the Scriptures, and that it will be found equally effective, as well as interesting and instructive, for fireside readings, especially on Sunday evenings, when the family meets for social intercourse. The publisher's remark is not without justification. The notes have small pretensions to originality; they assume to be scarcely more than compilations and adaptations from valuable works on Scripture, gathered up with the simple object of giving all the information within the author's reach to the class of working men and women whom she has taught weekly for some years past. But she has consulted some good authorities in popular literature in selecting her materials, and has thrown much earnestness into her treatment of the subject of the volume, which is, 'The Wanderings of the Israelites, a Type of the Christian's Pilgrimage to the Heavenly Canaan.'

*Poems.* By A. E. Hawkins. Pp. 250. London: Chapman and Hall, 193, Piccadilly.

THESE poems are evidently the outcome of a good and gentle spirit that feels healthily, thinks justly, and sings with ease. We have not found in them any-

thing that is very original in its form, or manner, or that burns itself in upon the mind of the reader with its fire. If none but first-class poetry should be printed, these poems have no claim to that distinction; but there are large circles of readers who take pleasure in verse of no higher rank than that of such as abounds in this volume.

*Essays, Sketches, and Poems.* By Andrew Wallace. Pp. 198. London: Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row.

'The Old Apothecary Hall, a Story,' 'Complaint of the Poor,' 'Monkton Castle,' 'Life on the Railway,' 'The Sea Storm,' and 'A Run into the Highlands,' are the principal sketches in Mr. Wallace's volume, and reveal his possession of some pleasing descriptive power. Amongst the smaller essays are one on Total Abstinence, and another on the Permissive Bill, and these enable us to congratulate the author on his clear insight into some of the urgent necessities of the age. A tone of quiet good sense is everywhere observable in his writing; and most of the sketches, and some poetical pieces which occur here and there in the volume, give evidence of his devotion to evangelical Christian doctrine and sentiment.

*The Scattered Nation.* A Monthly Magazine. Edited by C. Schwartz, D.D. Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

The editor of this magazine is a Hebrew Christian, and his desire in carrying it on is especially to be made useful to his Jewish brethren in helping to convince them that the Messiah has come. The number for May contains part of a tale of Jewish life in the time of our Lord, by the Rev. Dr. Edersheim, of Torquay; portion of a brief introduction to the study of the Books of Daniel and the Apocalypse; an article showing that the Saints of all ages are fellow-heirs; critical notices of Jewish sermons; an account of Hebrew Christians in Spain; the continuation of an article on Israel's present position and significance in the history of the world, and of a treatise on the fundamental principles of modern Judaism; and sundry other matter interesting to readers of the class for whom the magazine is designed.

*Old Jonathan; the District and Parish Helper.* London: W. H. Collingridge, Aldersgate-street.

In its new shape, 'Old Jonathan' has a very much improved appearance, and must be still more acceptable as a gift, and more likely to please as a purchase, than in its former somewhat awkward shape and size. The publisher, Mr. W. H. Collingridge, of the *City Press*, 117 to 120, Aldersgate-street, has taken into partnership his brother, Mr. Leonard Collingridge, who for many years has filled a position of confidence with him. The business will in future be carried on under the title of W. H. and L. Collingridge.

*Topics for Teachers: A New Work for Ministers, Sunday-school Teachers, and others, on an entirely Original Plan.* By James Cooper Gray, Halifax, author of 'The Class and the Desk.' London: Elliot Stock.

THE monthly numbers recently issued continue to give copious and well-arranged information about countries, natural objects, and persons mentioned in the Bible. The illustrations on wood and the coloured maps add much to the usefulness of the work, which, as it advances, proves itself to be one of great value to Sunday-school teachers and other Bible students. The ninth part, now out, concludes the first volume.

*Tracts of the Weekly Tract Society for the Religious Instruction of the Labouring Classes.* 62, Paternoster Row, London.

THESE tracts are printed in very large clear type, and having a little attempt at ornament at the top of the first page, are rather more attractive at first sight than tracts are wont to be. As they are almost all written in narrative form, with persons and conversations introduced, they will be more easily read, and are more likely to be read through, than compositions in more didactic style. They are very well adapted for perusal by the less

intelligent of the members of the labouring classes.

*The Hive: A Store-house of Material for Working Sunday-school Teachers.* London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

An admirable help for the Sunday-school teacher. It has now reached its 18th number, and appears in monthly pennyworths, which are worth much more than the money charged for them.

*The 'Neal Dow' Melody Book: A Collection of Temperance Hymns and Songs, with a number of Popular Tunes printed in the Tonic Sol-fa Notation.* By William Burgess. Glasgow: 30, Hope-street. Manchester: Tubbs and Brook.

A SELECTION of forty-eight good average temperance songs and eighteen hymns, with music, as specified in the title.

*National Education from a Temperance Standpoint. A Lecture,* by W. R. D. Gilbert, of Plymouth. Plymouth: William Brendon and Son.

A VERY valuable tract,—well conceived, and no less well written. We strongly recommend it.

*Self-Culture and Self-Reliance Under God the Means of Self-Elevation.* By William Unsworth. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

FULL of good stimulative advice for working men.

*The Appeal: A Magazine for the People.* Price One Halfpenny. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

*The Church.* A Monthly Magazine. Price One Penny. London: Elliot Stock.

*The Devon and Cornwall Temperance Journal, Advocate of the Permissive Bill, and Organ of the Devon and Cornwall Temperance League.*

# Meliora.

---

---

## CIVILIZATION AND HEALTH.

1. *A Physician's Problems.* By Charles Elam, M.D., M.R.C.P.  
London : Macmillan & Co. 1869.
2. *The Fortnightly Review*, August 1st, 1869. Art. II. Influence of Civilization on Health. By John Henry Bridges.
3. *Macmillan's Magazine*, August. Art. I. Roman Imperialism. II. The Fall of the Roman Empire.

EVERYBODY believes in civilization, with a credulity that is quite marvellous, considering how few ever seriously inquire what it means, whence it arises, and whither it tends. It is one of those terms that conveniently describe anything, from a new patent to the opening up of a new region to trade, or a new kingdom to thought. We positively toy with the word, as if it expressed all the potentialities of humanity, and so willingly pardon anybody who uses it that Buckle writes a History of Civilization in England without ever staying to define what he meant by the term, and it does not strike us as being at all strange. It is true we can gather from his work what he would have us mean by it, namely, the decay of superstition, the increase of useful knowledge, and the growth of general conception of life and of the universe. But such definitions are inadequate. They leave out of view those aggregations of the social body which reveal tendencies as plainly as anything else. A nomad might be free from superstition, wonderfully wise, and possessed with a grand notion of what Fichte calls the divine idea of the universe, but he would be a nomad still, a splendid barbarian, it might be, but not a civilized being. We find the same haze about the consciously ambitious definitions of others. Civil-

ization is the manhood of the race, says one ; when men are quick of thought, strong of will, pregnant with invention, and prone to induction. But at no time is it a fixed quantity ; it shifts its basis and has its periods of efflorescence and decay. It is despotic and material in Egypt, religious in Palestine, intellectual in Greece, legal and administrative in the Roman empire, agricultural in India, industrial in Great Britain and North America. ‘I believe with you,’ writes Dr. Arnold to the Archbishop of Dublin, ‘that *savages* could never civilize themselves, but barbarians I think might.’ Here, again, civilization is the resultant progress of outside forces acting upon inside qualities, or, in other words, the development of natural capacities. What, then, is the true state of nature, if, indeed, such a condition can be admitted ? A simple pastoral life, patriarchal, romantic, and tribal. But is the opposite of this necessarily a civilized state ? A nation of sea-kings would not answer to any of these simple conditions, and might yet be uncivilized, shedding blood freely, rioting in rude health, and with fuller conceptions of natural forces, of earths, and metals, and shipbuilding, and other arts. Civilization, observes another, taking a more modern estimate, is the conquest of mind over matter. Granted. The old Prometheus brought fire from heaven, and was chained to an incombustible rock for his pains ; the new Prometheus chains the fire, sublimes the rock, and moves freely through space, speaking his thought along the bed of the sea. But this conquest alone is not civilization. A German prince, travelling in this country, saw a stonebreaker by the wayside, and observed, ‘He is a true conqueror ; he rises on the ruins he makes.’ Does merely material progress produce this effect upon man ? We doubt it. The domination of the sensible is of itself a species of grandeur, but it does not express all we mean when we use the word civilization. Nor, if we alter the term, and speak of intellectual progress, do we exhaust its whole meaning. It is moral, as well as intellectual and material, or it hardly deserves to be honoured. Unless our moral acquisitions keep pace with industrial and scientific progress, we are so much the less civilized. Our sympathies ought to be wider, our wills stronger, our morality higher and clearer, or it is of little use that we know more, can reason better, and talk fluently about the law of continuity and the variegated woof of things. Thus all definitions are faulty. Civilization varies like colour, but like light it is a compound, and history is its re-distributing prism. It is not what we can do, but what we are, what we feel and not what we possess, the character of the individual as well as the magnitude

of the nation, the sweep of the mind as well as the greatness of its visible results, the sensitiveness of the moral power as well as the freedom or completeness of our ecclesiasticism, that constitute civilization. It is of no use pointing to imports and exports if the people are miserable, to giant mechanisms if our minds are mean and shrivelled, to great cities if they only serve to breed disease and sin, or to our marvellous acquaintance with the constitution of the sun if we are ignorant of the common laws of life, and legislate as blindly as the despots and Parliaments of the dark ages.

We have pressed home these few obvious considerations, because we cannot fail to discern that a readiness to sing paeans to civilization on every fitting or unfitting occasion is working disastrous results, vitiating our imaginations, and withdrawing our attention from problems that we ought to face and solve, ere their self-solution brings confusion and dismay. We have previously dealt with certain political aspects of the question,\* and we now propose to glance at some of the physical ones. A true civilization should bring all a man's powers, or a nation's powers, to the same high level. The industrial ought not to debase the intellectual, nor the moral the physical, nor the social the individual. There ought to be no combination of good architecture and bad masonry. Life ought to have some rhythm and proportion, and we ought to keep watch and ward on every known evil and possible source of imperfection. It is of little use perpetually making inductions that satisfy our vanity, unless we turn elsewhere and reason freely about those that should deepen our humiliation. We can do the first any day of our lives, amidst the shows and panoramas of things visible and tangible; but we less frequently see the shadows, the dark lines of the spectrum, the high price we pay for our external progress. The traveller, who mounts a pyramid, does not think of the numberless human beings that perished in the work of its construction, any more than the open-mouthed rustic, bewildered by the bustle and magnitude of modern city life, busies himself with speculations as to the tendencies behind all he sees, and the vast waste-heaps, or kitchen-middens, that our civilization offers to the exploration of the curious and the philosophic. We are proud to call our progress a conquest, and point to the decay of plagues, of barbarisms, of famines, and of cruel struggles for existence, temporary supremacy, or the raw materials of commerce. But there is the abyss on the other side; there are new diseases,

\* "The Limits of State Action."—*Meliora*, No. 44.

degenerations, new crimes, neglected laws, early deaths, insanities moral and material, and the fierce race and rush of things, bearing down the noble and the brave, the pure, the good, and the true. Suppose an intelligent nomad amongst us, civilised in mind, beyond us in the range and sweep of his physical knowledge, or at any rate capable of putting it to more heroic practical service. What would he think of us? We may crush it down into a sentence, 'Surely these people are mad!' He would say we were wise enough to know how much air an adult ought to consume in the twenty-four hours, yet cramped him in workshops, and rooms, and narrow streets, so that he could not possibly get it, or, if he managed to get it, only in a smoke-contaminated condition. He would remark that we knew the importance of water, yet polluted our rivers by sewage or manufacturing refuse; could tell precisely how much food was necessary to support life, and yet paid small heed to its purity or its goodness; believed in virtue, yet cared more for convicted vice, bodily, than for struggling honesty; understood the physical harmony of the body, taught its principles of action in our special schools, yet allowed one part of our system to bear all the strain, and brought up our youths in ignorance of the mischief such a course of action inevitably produced; gloried in the progress of our large towns, and the low death-averages of most of them, without understanding the real agents, their possible failure in the future, and the steps necessary to raise the health of the town-bred, as well as preserve the character of the reserves upon which we are so constantly and insensibly drawing; deprecated infanticide, yet made no effort to diminish the terrible mortality amongst the children of our thickly-populated districts; and preached the sanctity of life, whilst we increased its anguish by our competitions, diminished its vigour by our luxuries, excused its lassitude by our inventions, heightened its sensibility by our cultivation, and shortened its duration by our compression.

So heavy an indictment would not be absolutely true, and yet it would be justifiable to make it, seeing that we are at present more amusing ourselves with palliatives than with actual remedies, and painfully yield attention to all who seek to startle us from our somnolency. In many directions we are astir, wisely resolving to combat with the dangers that beset us; but our efforts are without system, we theorise where we ought to act, and whoever would proclaim a crusade is deemed an alarmist, and finds himself in rude collision with public bodies, vested interests, and defiant ignorance. The medical men of our large towns could tell us much had they

time, but they devote themselves steadily to abating the effects of evil rather than removing their causes, and as yet there is no professional chair devoted to public hygiene to give them the necessary stimulus in their early student life. Thus the large field of social and sanitary science is irregularly worked, and the toil is of the most thankless character. Reformers are never so much esteemed as discoverers; they irritate men's minds, and do not feed their vanity or lull their consciences. Social science for the million is laughed at by cultivated persons who would die of *ennui* without a summer health-tour, break down in their duties continually without a private physician's advice, and perish in a year in one of their workmen's cottages or labourer's abodes. They will flock in crowds to hear speculations about flint-weapon-men, glacial epochs, or the wandering of Sirius; but discuss sewage, physical education, agricultural labourers, compulsory sanitary enactments, or the alarming growth of cities and towns, and they cease to be interested, or pronounce them vulgar, or get into a passion, or become arrant sceptics, or endeavour to discomfit an opponent by a joke and annihilate him with a maxim. This neglect or distaste can be measured in another way. Compare the number and position of serials dealing specially with these questions with those devoted to simple amusement or the furtherance of class interests, or the relative proportions of physical and general subjects discussed in ordinary 'heavy' periodicals, or in Parliament.

Let us, however, deal for a time with a real problem, and do our best to divert attention from other subjects to one that is of vital concern for us all. We refer to the growth of our large towns, and the manner in which they are affecting the national health and character. The subject is an old one, ever recurring, and yet almost inexhaustible. We live in an age of great cities and towns. The stream of population sets in toward them from all points of a wide circumference, and year by year they go on increasing in bulk and numbers. Streets are added, green fields disappear, and the mighty mass moves outward, with far-reaching *antenneæ*, as though it possessed a consciously conquering spirit. The new comers are mostly from the agricultural districts, attracted by the promise of higher wages, more regular employment, and a gayer, brisker life. The greater proportion of them are young men and women, or newly-married persons with small families, who have acquired a good stock of health elsewhere. We may quote here to advantage one of the parallelisms drawn by Mr. Herbert Spencer in his clever but somewhat fantastic essay, 'The Social Organism,' because it illustrates the influx just

spoken of, though more intended to show the character of commercial movements :—

'In the lowest societies, as in the lowest creatures, the distribution of crude nutriment is by slow gurgitations and regurgitations. In creatures that have rude vascular systems, as in societies that are beginning to have roads and some transfer of commodities along them, there is no regular circulation in definite courses ; but instead, periodical changes of the currents—now towards this point, and now towards that. Through each part of an inferior mollusk's body the blood flows for a while in one direction, then stops and flows in the opposite direction ; just as through a rudely organized society the distribution of merchandise is slowly carried on by great fairs, occurring in different localities, to and from which the currents periodically set. Only animals of tolerably complete organizations, like advanced communities, are permeated by constant currents that are definitely directed. In living bodies, the local and variable currents disappear when there grow up great centres of circulation, generating more powerful currents, by a rhythm which ends in a quick, regular pulsation. And when in social bodies there arise great centres of commercial activity, producing and exchanging large quantities of commodities, the rapid and continuous streams drawn in and emitted by these centres, subdue all minor and local circulations : the slow rhythm of fairs merges into the faster one of weekly markets, and in the chief centres of distribution, weekly markets merge into daily markets ; while in place of the languid transfer from place to place, taking place at first weekly, then twice or thrice a week, we by and by get daily transfer, and finally transfer many times a day—the original sluggish, irregular rhythm becomes a rapid, equable pulse.'

Something very much resembling this is constantly going on about our large centres. They draw to them, as we have said, constant supplies of men and women from the surrounding districts. The tendency of population everywhere in a healthy community, not devastated by war or averse from marriage, is to go on rapidly increasing ; but the natural rate of increase itself will not explain the growth of English towns, and those who have watched the history of any one place for twenty years or so, will readily admit the influx in question. Where a new branch of manufacture springs up, or starts into rapid development and prosperity, this immigration can be seen and felt. Where it simply draws from other small towns, the effect is seen very speedily in diminished stature and in remarkable precocity. The result of the ordinary agricultural, or, as in the case of London, picked general, immigration is twofold,—the death-rate is reduced, on the one hand, and the new comers plunge, with a temporary impunity, into all the gaieties and dissipation provided for a hard-worked population, on the other. Life, social, commercial, intellectual, is busier, and presses more heavily in these great centres. With the mass there is either no time or no disposition for refining pursuits, and their only relief to a wearying repetition of crowded hours is a round of fierce dissipation, in which all persons are agreed in admitting the immigrant stands unrivalled. The general results of this city life, tempered though it may be by healthful relaxation,

are well known. The body rounds earlier, or wastes earlier, the complexion becomes sallow, or ashy pale, and the general motions of the body are quick and impulsive. Few things betray habitat more than gait and the poise of the head ; it takes a rustic recruit months and months of drill to walk with his legs instead of lifting them up as though the spring had fixed itself in its back ; and, when he has learnt to walk well, he lets out the secret of his origin elsewhere. The nervous system grows in power and irritability, and hence physical endurance, such as pure and continued muscular exertion entails, is lessened, but for short periods is increased, whilst the brain can bear a tension that would drive a plain rustic mad. Narcotic stimulants too often follow and increase this irritability, and the increase does not tend towards real power.

But this is by no means all. Some of our large towns have sprung up on healthy sites, and others on unhealthy ones, and the manufactures carried on in them are frequently unhealthy, bring the sexes together earlier than would otherwise be the case, and with good wages lead to early marriages and feeble offspring. The open spaces in our large towns are few, the atmosphere is full of unconsumed carbon and noxious gases given off from coal and in manufactures, the water supply can no longer be taken from the springs with impunity, and in a hundred other directions new evils arise. When infectious diseases make their appearance, even ordinary infantile affections, they rage with virulence in the crowded parts. The food supplies have also to be carefully watched, or human cupidity will take advantage of common ignorance. The interment of the dead, the cartage of refuse, the removal of manures, the outlet of the sewage, all demand attention. A constant fight has to be kept up by individuals and by the authorities to provide for health, safety, easy communication, and the punishment of the predatory and the deliberately selfish. Need we wonder if, under such nicely-balanced conditions, with such adverse forces about, in air and water, house, street, soil, and food, health should suffer, doctors flourish, children die, and men decay ? Wealth, the increasing number of medical charities, facilities for suburban living, for baths, and the like, are to be reckoned as favourable to health; but it is a moot point whether some of them do not tend to hereditary deterioration by the preservation of the sickly, who incur the responsibilities of parentage with a recklessness that is quite appalling.

Of the fact of such town-growth there is no doubt. 'In 1811,' says Mr. Bridges, 'there were fifty-one towns containing above 10,000 inhabitants, and these towns contained twenty-

four per cent. of the population. In 1861 there were 165 of these towns, containing forty-four per cent. of the population. In 1811 there were sixteen towns over 20,000; in 1861 there were seventy-two; containing nineteen per cent. of the population in the first case, and thirty-eight in the second. In 1811 there was no town in England, except London, with a population over 100,000; in 1861 there were twelve such towns, and they contained one quarter of the population.' We have not therefore magnified the possibilities of deterioration and evil. Nor is the fact of immigration less doubtful. According to Dr. Morgan, of Manchester, if we divide the population of London, Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham into two parts, those above and those below the age of twenty, more than half the adult population is immigrant. Out of an adult population of 2,200,000, only 1,000,000 is 'native and to the manner born,' or five out of every eleven. The two places most noted for their high health-rate, or what is almost but not quite the same thing, low death-rate—London and Birmingham—draw ninety per cent. of their immigrants from the agricultural and ten per cent. from the industrial group of counties. Where there is no such agricultural influx, or conditions of labour aggravate ordinary town life, the death-rate is correspondingly high, and more especially amongst the infantile population whose viability is a pretty good test of the general strength of the community. Thus, in Liverpool, one out of every four children that are born dies before it is a year old, and the death-rate is thirteen per cent. up to five years old. In the cotton towns the rate is one child out of every five up to a year old, and ten per cent. up to five years. In England at large the average deaths for the first year are one in six, and in some favoured agricultural districts one in ten, or for the first five years exactly half that of Liverpool. Nor are these survivors all 'the fittest'—to use Mr. Herbert Spencer's phrase for natural selection. In Liverpool the death-rate drops to about the same as elsewhere between the ages of ten to fifteen, where, curiously enough, it is alike—about 500 per 100,000—in healthy and unhealthy populations; but the rise is gradual after that period, and at mature life (forty-five to fifty-five) is 3,500 per 100,000. We have thus two markedly fatal periods, that of infancy and that of reproduction, and many of those who escape the perils of the first succumb to those of the second. But we may judge of the health of great towns in another way. Take the number of medical men, and notice the rate of increase in their ranks, and how rapidly it rises when a town passes 50,000 inhabitants and is pretty prosperous. We should like to see the number of

ineffectives amongst the adult males tabulated in the same way as in army returns, and the number of days of sickness in the year per head. We imagine this would startle us much more than a mere death return, and possibly indicate some of the recurring maladies to which the inhabitants of large towns are liable, and which, when not positively fatal, so far undermine the constitution as to lessen all future power of resistance to disease.

How are we to meet this problem? We cannot hinder the influx into the great towns without impeding our industrial civilization. We have to accept the fact, and make the best of it. 'There are two forces available for the renovation of society,' remarks Mr. Bridges, 'the first is capital, and the second scientifically trained intellect;' but at present neither is employed. The manufacturer accumulates wealth, too often regardless of the lives shortened in his service, and the landed proprietor, who might influence him, will not, either by precept or example. We have professors by the hundred of all things under the sun and about it, but, so far as we know, not a single chair devoted to hygiene or sanitary science. The first thing we need is 'a consolidation and revision of our whole sanitary legislation,' followed by a national system of health inspection. 'The few medical officers of health whom we at present possess,' says Mr. Bridges, 'are elected by local authorities, not the likeliest of electing bodies to choose men resolute to put the laws against nuisances into force. Moreover, by the present system, the outlying rural or semi-manufacturing districts are utterly neglected. Two hundred medical inspectors, sufficiently, not extravagantly, paid, devoted exclusively to public work, trained not merely in the ordinary curriculum, but also in a special course of hygiene, would cost the country from £60,000 to £80,000 a year, half the cost of the Leeds Infirmary, one-third the cost of an iron-clad ship.' Ignorance must be combated by beginning at the source, and incorporating 'a very short and very simple catechism of health' into our national curriculum. We must have more breathing spaces in all our large towns, wider streets, roomier houses, purer water, less adulterated food. Working men are themselves active in shortening the hours of labour, and the extension of the Factory Acts is curbing the cupidity and recklessness of employers. The first duty of a municipality is to make a town healthy; afterwards, let them make it beautiful. Money is often wasted in fine public buildings that would prove a much more remunerative investment if laid out in promenades, gymnasiums, cricket grounds, and open squares. Local taxation is very much complained

of just now, but throwing poor-rates on the consolidated fund will not remove sources of disease and decay. We may afford to laugh at alarmists, and turn our science in any direction but the right one so long as our population goes on increasing at the present rate, and our revenue shows few signs of diminishing elasticity; but there are two facts we ought to bear in mind in all our forecastings—the first is, the growing disinclination to marriage amongst the middle-classes, except upon £300 a year, and the second is, the deterioration of our reserve and agricultural stock. The first, if we are to believe Professor Seeley, is akin to the main cause of the fall of the Roman empire. Other empires fell through division and disintegration, as did the Saracen empire, the Seljukian empire, the Mogul empire, and as the Ottoman empire is doing before our very eyes. But Roman civilization was military,—that is destructive; it gained, but did not keep; won wealth by conquest, and lost it in luxury. The real root of the evil was a stationary population, and this was attested in the time of Polybius and the Second Punic War. ‘Julius Cæsar when he attained to supreme power found an alarming thinness of population. Both he and his successor struggled earnestly against this evil. The grave maxim of Metellus Macedonicus, that marriage was a duty which, however painful, every citizen ought manfully to discharge, acquired great importance in the eyes of Augustus. He caused the speech in which it was contained to be read in the Senate: had he lived in our day he would have reprinted it with a preface.’ The Lex Julia was an enactment consisting ‘of a number of privileges and precedences given to marriage. It was in fact a handsome bribe offered by the State to induce the citizens to marry.’ The Professor adds, ‘The same phenomenon—a stationary population—had shown itself in Greece before its conquest by the Romans.’ The first effect of an industrial civilization is to promote early marriages and large families; the second will be, we fear, to reduce both. The double danger deserves consideration. We are keeping up our present rapid increase by the first, and misery and degeneration so frequently succeed that we are the more in danger of rushing to the other extreme.

What shall we say of our reserve stock of health and future town population? Our ‘bold peasantry’ are far from being their country’s pride; they are its disgrace. The yeoman has almost disappeared, and the agricultural labourer is worse off than ever, and his class is more numerous. The sturdy and adventurous seek a home and an independency in our colonies, and leave behind the sickly and the spiritless. Wages are

low. Women and children are underfed, and all are miserably educated. We have been joking about the matter hitherto, and even now are not quite certain what to do with such human specimens, most of our generosity taking the shape of prizes at agricultural shows. But we must wake up, and reach these classes in many ways. It is our duty to begin by trying to improve the landlords. They must provide good houses, and schools must be had somehow, either through local rates, or by the Consolidated Fund. Something like hope must be infused into these children of the land, and it can only come by moderately and cheaply gratifying their natural earth-hunger. To the peasant-soldier of France, says M. Michelet, the acquisition of land is 'a combat ; he goes to it as he would to the charge, and will not retreat. It is his battle of Austerlitz ; he will win it.' There is no such hope for the present agricultural labourer in this country. He has only three openings ; to live and die like his father before him, to press city-ward and lower wages, or to enlist as a soldier and fight, if fighting there be, or serve his time out to retire upon a pension and job away the remainder of his days. And yet every peasant is an integer in our health-capital, and ought to be tended as carefully and nourished as lovingly as we look after our own children who are to be the sires of future races. The agricultural counties of England are our great hunting grounds. Towns will grow and large bodies will attract ; but, unless the new comers bring health with them, we may expect some decline of national prosperity, which will be more gloomy than the failure of our coal-fields, more fatal than the paralysis of our manufacture.

We come now to more individual considerations. We have complained that the term civilization should be used, and not defined ; we have spoken of health, and never so much as hinted at a definition. It will be difficult to find anything better than what Mr. Bridges gives us. Here are two definitions—'the greatest energy of every part, compatible with the energy of the whole ;' 'Being able to do a good day's work easily.' We prefer the first one, because it seems to us to avoid the fallacy, so common in some analyses, of taking the rude savage as the type of health, or muscular endurance as its one indispensable condition. There cannot well be a greater mistake. A state of nature may render a man's flesh firmer and more readily inclined to heal, and enable him to do extraordinary feats, but it reduces him to a compound of muscle, digestion, and sex. There is no balance of functions ; animality is predominant, and the energy of the brave is expended in the minor and more automatic directive

functions. It is degraded, and cannot be elevated without years of culture and centuries of hereditary transmission. It is not so with the muscular system. Bulk and fibrine may be facts of inheritance, but a healthy civilized man may acquire physical strength in a thousandth part of the time that it would take for the savage to acquire brain-power. True health varies with the character of the demands civilization makes upon the organism. Where there is no polity to administer, no excessive thought required in any one but the singer and the story-teller, health is capacity for endurance, for hunting, for war, for out-door life in the woods or the plains. But it is folly to suppose this type of health is the only one. When we shift the stress of life to another basis, we must make another ideal, taking care to violate no ordinary conditions or laws of life in its creation. A city merchant, or a professional man, can get through an amount of mental exercise in four or six hours that would positively destroy the brain of a wild man by rupturing its vessels. In the state-of-nature man dreams, he does not think, and his life is composed of violent activities and temporary collapses. We find excessive exertion produce the same effect in civilized races. The Greek athletæ ate enormously and slept away half their time, and yet they were healthy men. We doubt whether any human being, who answers to the rude primitive health type, would live as long as a modern whose life should not show either physical or mental excesses. He would certainly be unable to compete with a modern gymnast. We see, therefore, that health has no fixed standard except obedience to the simple laws of life, and if we would make it compatible with a high industrial civilization, we must not attempt to restore the nomadic type. There is plenty for us to do without such efforts. As the *Times* very cleverly put it, in a leading article Dr. Elam quotes, there are good playing and good working constitutions, and the terms indicate the exact point of difference between the old and the modern standard. We can get a higher kind of activity out of the latter, and our main duty is to see that it does not imperil the functions that minister to it. To do this there is need of more physical education than we at present think necessary, not only in earlier life, but right through to full manhood. The virtuous gymnast grows in height and breadth until his thirty-sixth year, and there is no reason why a moderate amount of gymnastics, of a simple and general kind, should not be indulged by all adult males up to and even beyond that period. The nervous and muscular systems are beautifully adapted to each other, and the exercise of the second soothes and clarifies the

action of the first, whilst the exhaustion of nervous energy withdraws power from the muscles, and leads to their wasting and softness. It is doubtful, however, whether we can ever have the maximum of brain-energy simultaneously with high physical energy, or a perfect balance of all the powers, but there is no reason why they should not alternate. The present writer has been ridiculed by his friends many a time for conditioning for extended mental efforts, but he has in every case discovered its wisdom as well as its necessity. Where physical exercise is taken in abundance, there may be short, sharp spells of brain labour, but weariness soon supervenes, and the body conquers the will. For months of continuous labour it is therefore best, for days of intentional strain it is impolitic to take excessive out-door or gymnastic exercise. When the work is done, resume, with care, the cultivation of the body, and it will be soon found which plan is best.

'There has been a pastoral age, and a hunting age, and a fighting age. Now we have arrived at the age sedentary,' says Pisistratus Caxton to Albert Trevanian, Esq., M.P. It is quite true. We sit half our time, and then complain if we are not strong. And here it is our duty to correct a common error. Mental pursuits are not unhealthy in themselves. They as plainly tend to longevity as virtue does. 'Not long ago,' says Dr. Elam, 'a friend reviewed with us the names of the six or eight upper wranglers for the last twenty years. With very few exceptions, these and nearly all the "double first" men are alive and well at the present time. A stronger proof could scarcely be imagined that even excessive brain-work has little or no destructive influence upon life and reason; if, indeed, it does not compel us to recognise its directly conservative tendency. Contrast this with the effect of hard bodily training, as manifested in boating. We have complete and reliable information as to the history of two boats crews of picked men, within the last few years, not one of whom is now alive. Such havoc was surely never experienced amongst mental athletes.' This position is further strengthened by tables and averages we have not room to cite. Hence we reach the general proposition, that whatever tends to ennoble life—art, culture, religion—tends to strengthen and extend it. We see here the designing hand of Providence. What, then, are the lessons of this law? They are many. Good scholars are the sons of scholars. Suddenly adopted studious habits, in an unprepared constitution, are hurtful and often fatal. We must beware how we overwork the young when the brain is tender, the bones soft, the constitution unformed. We must extend our physical

knowledge so as to be able to interpret the hints of the body, and take care to obey them. ‘Not what is *done*, but what is *neglected*, seems to be the *fons et origo malorum*.’ If the simple laws of health are despised, the student will suffer, no matter whether he be a divine or a materialist. The worker, also, must learn to understand his own body, and the condition of its highest labour. He must mistrust all sudden bursts of inspiration, purchased at the cost of violated laws, or by mechanical or chemical means. ‘Spend on your genius, and by system,’ is a wise man’s advice to the few, that ought not to be despised by the many.

A sadder part of our subject remains. It is not enough to have pointed out the general tendencies of city life or suggested how health may be improved; we must take a glimpse, of the too frequently sad physical consequences of civilization on the race. We are just beginning to understand the laws of inheritance, to see that what is a tendency in the parent may become a passion in the offspring, to recognise that the moral writes itself out in the facts of physical structure, and that when we desire the emancipation of the will we must pay some heed to the imperfections of organization. Dr. Elam has written an essay on natural heritage that, in spite of hesitation and defect, deserves to be widely read and seriously pondered. He is a firm believer in the double law of inheritance, uniformity and diversity, and illustrates its operation by many new and interesting facts. Acquired and habitual vice, he says, transmits its corruption just as much as physical disease, and the one is not more potent than the other. If our cities breed a bad type, moral or physical, the type is propagated, the one issuing in criminality, the other in disease and extinction of the special line. Diseases, according to Dr. Gull, are but ‘perverted life-processes, and have for their natural history not only a beginning, but a period of culmination and decline. . . . The effect of disease may be for a third or fourth generation, but the laws of health are for a thousand.’ It thus happens that the racial type tends, in the long run, to maintain itself, and all evil hindrances are eliminated, though at an expense of life that is frightful to contemplate. So far as we can make out, brain-power follows the law of uniformity and physical imperfections also, but there are so many exceptions we cannot be absolutely sure which law will operate. The sons of clever men, whose nerve-power has been exhausted, are sometimes shallow and idiotic, and occasionally a genius will start from an apparently obscure line. Very much depends on marriage or inter-marriage, though we

cannot enter here into the large question of consanguinity. 'Amongst ancient families quick men are abundant,' observes Mr. Knight, 'but a deep and clear reasoner is seldom seen.' There is the luxury-imbecile, as well as the imbecile of the poor. The curiosities of inheritance are, indeed, manifold. A physical affection in the parent may become a mental one in the offspring, or *vice versa*, and Jewesses of ravishing beauty will spring from parents inexpressibly ugly. Independently of directly vicious tendency, inherited from parents, Dr. Elam calls attention to the enfeeblement of will which follows the use of nervine stimulants or indulgence in sensual delights. This is unhappily so common as to need no facts to illustrate it. We see gifted men swayed, like aspen leaves, by every breath of impulse, and criminals influenced by an imitative instinct to a most remarkable degree. Our criminal epidemics are due to this enfeeblement of the will, and possibly some of the wonders of mesmerism might be referred to the same cause. 'Some persons,' says Dr. O. W. Holmes, the American medico-novelist, 'talk about the human will as if it stood upon a high look-out, with plenty of light, and elbow-room reaching to the horizon. Doctors are constantly noticing how it is tied and darkened by inferior organization, by disease, and all sorts of crowding interferences; until they get to look upon Hottentots and Indians—and a good many of their own race too—as a kind of self-conscious blood-clocks, with very limited power of self-determination; and they find it as hard to hold a child accountable in any moral point of view for inherited bad temper, or tendency to drunkenness, as they would to blame him for inheriting gout or asthma.' But we cannot pursue this sad and complicated subject further, and must leave its lessons to enforce themselves. 'Each of us,' again to quote Dr. Holmes, 'is only the footing-up of a double column of figures that goes back to the first pair. Every unit tells, and some of them are *plus*, and some *minus*. If the columns don't add up right, it is commonly because we can't make out all the figures.'

---

#### J. S. MILL ON 'THE SUBJECTION OF WOMEN.'

THE shades of Mary Wollstonecroft and Lady Morgan are avenged. The fingers that penned the 'Vindication of Women's Rights' in 1791, and 'Woman and her Master' in 1840, belonged to minds of no common order; but none

would have been more intensely gratified than those literary champions of their sex, could they have foreseen the arrival of 'the hour and the man' in the publication of this masterly essay by one of the ruling intellects of his day. He can command what they could not—an audience of which the great majority is composed neither of sneerers nor triflers; and whatever influence such views are qualified to exert on the reformation of society, cannot but be largely and immediately exerted, when the integrity and ability of the advocate are acknowledged by the civilised world. And it admits of no doubt whatever that the thinking part of the community is settling down in earnest to the consideration of the cause he has undertaken. Old commonplaces are receiving a rigid sifting, and old prejudices are melting before an honest desire to look the facts fully in the face, and to do what is best for both great sections, male and female, of the human race.

We shall first of all attempt to discharge our duty as reviewers, by presenting a condensed statement of Mr. Mill's train of reasoning, following up this epitome by some reflections of our own upon Mr. Mill's argument and the question at large.

Undue prolixity cannot be charged against the author of the '*Subjection of Women*', for his discussion occupies but four chapters, barely extending to 188 pages, in leaded type; and in thus compressing his advocacy he has been guided by a judicious regard to the nature of the subject and the state of the public taste. A big book, however great the name upon it, would have been little read, and Mr. Mill, within the bounds of this short treatise, has said nearly all, in substance, that can be advanced in the maintenance of his proposition. The meat is strong, if there is not very much of it; and those who are not satisfied with its quality would have turned away with disgust from an ampler dish. Without a word of preface Mr. Mill commences his first chapter by stating his object to be to explain the grounds of one of his earliest convictions—'that the principle which regulates the existing social relations between the two sexes—the legal subordination of one sex to the other—is wrong in itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement; and that it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privilege on the one side nor disability on the other.' This task, he says, is very arduous, for it has to contend with feelings 'the most intense and most deeply rooted of all those which gather round and protect old institutions and customs.' Ordinarily the burden of proof is allowed to be with the 'affirmative, and on those who

contend for restrictions or prohibitions ; but in this case the principle of female subordination is supposed, from universal usage and popular sentiment, to have a presumption in its favour 'superior to any conviction which an appeal to reason has power to produce in any intellects but those of a high class.' But the authority of men over women did not spring from 'a conscientious comparison between different modes of constituting the government of society'—though, even then, the original considerations might, in the roll of ages, have ceased to exist ; but the present system rests on theory only, and was never the result of any experiment or design having the good of society as its object. 'It arose simply from the fact that from the very earliest twilight of human society, every woman (owing to the value attached to her by men, combined with her inferiority in muscular strength) was found in a state of bondage to some man. Laws and systems of polity always begin by recognising the relations they find already existing between individuals. They convert what was a mere physical fact into a legal right, give it the sanction of society, and principally aim at the substitution of public and organised means of asserting and protecting those rights, instead of the irregular and lawless conflict of physical strength.' Thus originated the system of legalised slavery, slowly yielding at last to those ideas of justice which have also changed the once universal slavery of women into a milder form of dependence, but a state having, after all, no other or higher source than the law of the strongest. It is this fact which seems so incredible to the general public, who, because the law of the strongest is no longer professed as the ground of action, cannot suppose it to operate here. Yet, in former ages, the law of superior strength was the rule of life—a rule only modified by compact and promise, or by the growing strength of the once inferior classes. Military despotism even yet extensively flourishes, despite splendid examples of the contrary system ; and it is not, therefore, surprising that the dominion of man over woman, though having no other origin than brute force, should have continued to our own time. This is a power in which the whole male sex is interested, who have peculiar reasons for maintaining it, while 'each individual of the subject class is in a chronic state of bribery and intimidation combined.'

To the objection that the government of the male sex is natural, and hence unlike slavery, etc., Mr. Mill replies, 'Was there ever any domination which did not appear natural to those who possessed it ?' Slave-rule, absolute monarchy, and the very law of force itself, have all seemed natural,

because common ; and ‘the subjection of woman to man being a universal custom, any departure from it quite naturally appears unnatural.’ To another objection—that the rule of man over woman is not one of force, but accepted by woman voluntarily—Mr. Mill replies, that a great number of women do not accept it, as appears from numerous protests and agitations ; and many more, it may be presumed, would cherish similar aspirations if not taught to repress them as contrary to the proprieties of their sex. ‘It must be remembered, also, that no enslaved class ever asked for complete liberty at once ;’ and women are not likely to rebel collectively against the power of men, because their masters ‘have put everything in practice to enslave their minds,—training them in the belief of an ideal of character the very opposite to that of man ; ‘not self-will, and government by self-control, but submission, and yielding to the control of others ;’ and this means of influence the selfishness of man has used to the utmost by representing to women ‘meekness, submissiveness, and resignation of all individual will into the hands of a man as an essential part of sexual attractiveness.’ But the whole progress of society is opposed to the doctrine of man’s government of woman, for that progress has consisted in casting-off the notions of a fixed condition of life irrespective of individual capacity and choice ; and if the principle of free competition is right, ‘we ought to act as if we believed it, and not to ordain that to be born a girl instead of a boy, any more than to be born black instead of white, or a commoner instead of a nobleman, shall decide the person’s position through all life—shall interdict people from all the more elevated social positions, and from all, except a few, respectable occupations.’

The fact that the condition of woman has been approaching nearer to an equality with that of man, during all the progressive period of history, offers a presumption, though not a proof, that complete equality must be attained. To say that ‘the nature of the two sexes adapts them to their present functions and positions, and renders these appropriate to them,’ is met by Mr. Mill with the denial that any one knows, or can know, the nature of the two sexes, as long as they have only been seen in their present relation to one another. ‘What is now called the nature of woman is an eminently artificial thing—the result of forced repression in some directions, unnatural stimulation in others.’ The subject is one on which ‘nothing final can be known so long as those who alone can really know it, women themselves, have given but little testimony, and that little mostly suborned.’ We know, he says,

next to nothing of women as they are, and 'the greater part of what women write about women is mere sycophancy to men ;' even literary women, 'in this country especially, are themselves such artificial products that their sentiments are compounded of a small element of individual observation and consciousness, and a very large one of acquired associations ;' and so it will remain 'as long as social institutions do not admit the free development of originality in women which is possible to men.' Room for trial must be afforded : 'One thing we may be certain of—that what is contrary to women's nature to do they never will be made to do by simply giving their nature free play.' Those who speak of wifehood as the natural vocation of woman, yet act as if they believed that it would not be chosen were women permitted other means of support and occupation.

Chapter Two treats of the marriage contract and the harsh conditions as to the woman formerly affixed to it—even yet 'the wife is the actual bondservant of her husband ; no less so, as far as legal obligation goes, than slaves commonly so called.' All her property is his, and even the contrivance of marriage settlements merely preserves the principal from the husband's control,—the income is his as soon as it falls into his wife's possession. What is hers is his ; but 'the maxim is not applied against the man except to make him responsible to third parties for her acts, as a master is for the acts of his slaves or of his cattle. I am far from pretending that wives are in general no better treated than slaves ; but no slave is a slave to the same lengths, and in so full a sense of the word, as a wife is.' Over their children she never has any legal rights ; even after he is dead, she is not their legal guardian unless by will he has made her so. If she leaves him he can compel her return, or he may seize whatever she may earn or otherwise receive. A judicial separation can only now be obtained in cases of desertion or of extreme cruelty. Liberty of re-marriage is even then not allowed. 'No amount of ill-usage, without adultery superadded, will in England free a wife from her tormentor.' Mr. Mill discriminates between the wife's legal position and her actual treatment ; and the marriage-tie affords the strongest example of the 'feelings and interests which in many men exclude, and in most greatly temper, the impulses and propensities which lead to tyranny ;' but the elements of good do not justify the potentialities of evil. No institution is to be judged of from its best instances, and in every grade of the scale from virtue to vice are to be found men to whom are committed all the legal powers of a husband. The wife is subject to personal violence, on which

there can be little check unless after a first or second conviction she should be entitled to a divorce, or at least a judicial separation. Mr. Mill pourtrays in very eloquent terms (pp. 64-66) the misery to which, short of the worst excesses, the lust of power may subject its domestic victims; and he eulogises the value of putting the bad propensities of human nature under such legal restraints as may induce their repression, 'until repression in time becomes a second nature.' He grants the wife's power of retaliation, which has 'the fatal defect—that it avails most against the least tyrannical superiors and in favour of the least deserving dependants.' The corrupting effects of marital power are tempered by personal affection, a common interest in children and others, the wife's real importance, and her acquired influence by familiar intercourse; but much of the power thus exercised by the wife is for evil, because without regard, and often in opposition, to interests outside the domestic sphere. To the objection that a deciding authority must rest somewhere, Mr. Mill replies that, of two persons, one needs not be absolute master, still less needs the law decide which of them it shall be. It does not do so in business partnerships. 'The natural arrangement is a division of powers between the two; each being absolute in the executive branch of their own department, and any change of system and principle requiring the consent of both;' and the practical decision might greatly depend, 'as it even now does,' upon comparative qualifications—age, mental characteristics, and the like. The objection that wives would never be satisfied with anything short of unlimited sway, is answered by the popular admission that women are better than men, and by their self-sacrifice for the family good. The wilful woman is given a fictitious advantage by the law as it is, since it 'practically declares that the measure of what she has a right to, is what she can contrive to get.' Mr. Mill argues that the equality of married persons before the law is 'the only means of rendering the daily life, in any high sense, a school of moral cultivation,' the ground of which must lie in that sense of justice which claims nothing which is not as freely conceded. Mr. Mill admits that numbers of married people, probably a great majority of the higher classes, 'live in the spirit of a just law of equality;' and he claims the support of such for the principles he advocates. They must not imagine that this spirit of equality prevails with others because it does so with themselves. The objection that 'religion imposes the duty of obedience' on the wife, is rejected as an aspersion on Christianity. On the right of a woman to her own property, Mr. Mill lays down the rule that 'whatever

would be the husband's or wife's if they were not married should be under their exclusive control during marriage,' and where the family's support depends on earnings 'the common arrangement, by which the man earns the income and the wife superintends the domestic expenditure, seems to me the most suitable division of labour between the two persons.' Yet faculties specially adapted for some other pursuit might be exercised where provision was made against loss to family interests.

In chapter Three Mr. Mill advances to consider the admissibility of women to 'all the functions and occupations hitherto retained as the monopoly of the stronger sex.' The objection of a mental inferiority in women is shown to be irrelevant, since competition would prevent 'important employments from falling into the hands of women inferior to average men or to the average of their male competitors. The only result would be that there would be fewer women than men in such employments; a result certain to happen in any case, if only from the preference always likely to be felt by the majority of women for the one vocation in which there is nobody to compete with them.' In advocating the right of women to the Parliamentary and municipal suffrage, Mr. Mill separates this question from that 'of competing for the trust itself.' Since Mr. Mill wrote this paragraph the law has conferred the municipal franchise on women, and the use they make of this trust will, no doubt, have a powerful influence in determining the question of their admission to the Parliamentary electorship. That women are qualified for the higher professions and public offices, Mr. Mill argues, because of what they have done—their faculty for government having been shown, he contends, in a signal manner; and he asks, 'Is it reasonable to think that those who are fit for the greater functions of politics are incapable of qualifying themselves for the less?\*' Women's talents have a general bent towards the practical, arising out of their keen intuitive capacity—a power of perceiving what is immediately before them; and thus they not only are preserved from many forms of speculative error, but are peculiarly qualified to carry the results of speculation into practice. The greater quickness of apprehension shown by women also fits them for the promptitude necessary in prac-

\* Mr. Mill, while he omits all reference to Isabella of Spain, a transcendent example, refers to Queen Elizabeth as having showed herself equal to the greatest political duties; though Froude's exposure of her vacillation and caprice, at grave political junctures, must make her a dangerous illustration. For an equally sufficient reason Queen Mary I. and Queen Anne must be left out of the exemplary account.

tical life; and to the objection that their nervous susceptibility renders them 'mobile, changeable, too vehemently under the influence of the moment, incapable of dogged perseverance, unequal and uncertain in the power of using their faculties,' Mr. Mill replies (pp. 111-119) with exceeding ingenuity, if not with convincing success. To the objection that woman has a smaller brain than man, Mr. Mill replies that the fact is doubtful, and that size of brain is only one source of power—activity, in which women excel, being another. As to mental differences between the sexes, Mr. Mill strenuously denies that we know, or at present have means of knowing, 'whether there are any natural differences at all; or, supposing all artificial causes of differences to be withdrawn, what natural character would be revealed.' The supposed demonstration of such a difference and inferiority—the absence of any woman's production in philosophy, science, or art, entitled to the first rank—he vigorously grapples with in order to show that the admitted fact does not warrant the induction. The argument is pursued (pp. 126-141) with Mr. Mill's accustomed subtlety, and the considerations he advances are well adapted to weaken the reader's confidence in the popular conclusion, though we cannot regard them as supplying an adequate explanation of the fact. It is one thing to show that failure *may* be traced to such and such conditions; it is another to conclude that the conditions have led to the failure. Even the conditions, where operative, if freely accepted, may be considered as evidence of idiosyncracies at variance with supreme excellence and distinction. Mr. Mill, however, is fairly justified in claiming that nothing shall be assumed as absolutely true till opportunity has been afforded for the appearance of disproof. On the subject of moral differences between the sexes, Mr. Mill accepts the compliment that women are better than men as proving, if a fact, the corrupting influence upon men of the power they possess. That women are swayed by their personal partialities is a result due, he asserts, to their training. That they do not complain of their subordinate condition *may* be true, but the same is true of all cases of servitude; it is the tyranny, not the tyrannous power, which is at first complained of. 'Women cannot be expected to devote themselves to the emancipation of women, until men in considerable numbers are prepared to join with them in the undertaking.'

Chapter Four is an answer to the question, 'What good are we to expect from the changes proposed in our customs and institutions?' Mr. Mill alleges 'the advantage of having the most universal and pervading of all human relations regulated

by justice instead of injustice'—the effects of existing injustice being to foster 'a self-worship of the male,' which generates pride, overbearingness, and domestic oppression. All that education and civilisation are doing to efface the influence of the law of force on human character is antagonised by the legal subordination of women—the law of the strongest. Mr. Mill alleges as a second benefit the 'doubling the mass of mental faculties available for the higher service of humanity,'—a result arising partly from the better and more complete intellectual education of women, and partly from the expansion of the faculties which greater freedom would ensure. Women would also exert a better moral influence on society, because they would take in a larger range of objects, and bring to bear upon the philanthropic agencies they espouse a more enlightened knowledge of the causes and remedies of social evils. The influence of wives would also operate, not as it now often does, as a drag on the higher aspirations and enterprises of their husbands, but as an incentive and support, because they would be more willing to encounter those sacrifices of social conveniences and considerations which they have been taught to regard as their worldly idols. A marked effect, Mr. Mill contends, would also follow in diminishing those differences of sentiment and taste by which the harmony of the married life is now so frequently disturbed, and its benefits reduced. Sympathy and gradual assimilation of character 'would be a common, if not the commonest, case in marriage, did not the totally different bringing-up of the two sexes make it next to an impossibility to form a really well-assorted union.' The deteriorating effect on the husband of a union with a woman his inferior is described; and Mr. Mill avows his conviction that 'the moral regeneration of mankind will only really commence when the most fundamental of the social relations is placed under the rule of equal justice, and when human beings have to cultivate their strongest sympathy with an equal in rights and in cultivation.' Then enters in a consideration of 'the unspeakable gain in private happiness to the liberated half of the species; the difference to them between a life of subjection to the will of others and a life of rational freedom.' Women deprived of this freedom ask for compensation in power, which foments a 'passion for personal beauty, and dress, and display, and all the evils that flow from it in the way of mischievous luxury and social immorality. The love of power and the love of liberty are in eternal antagonism. Where there is least liberty the passion for power is the most ardent and unscrupulous.' How much, too, of womanly happiness is lost

for 'want of a worthy outlet for the active faculties,' compelling many to resort to uncongenial pursuits, and confining more to a limited range of activity for which they have no educated aptitude and skill. Mr. Mill concludes by calling upon men not to add 'jealous and prejudiced restrictions' to the evils which nature inflicts; and by asserting that 'any restraint in the freedom of conduct of any human fellow-creatures (except otherwise than by making them responsible for any evil actually caused by it) dries up *pro tanto* the principal fountain of human happiness, and leaves the species less rich, to an inappreciable degree, in all that makes life valuable to the individual human being.'

Having now done justice to the exceedingly able production of Mr. Mill by reproducing all its leading points, clothed and coloured, as far as within our limits was possible, by the author's *ipsissima verba*, we shall place before the reader some reflections, as a stimulus to his own thoughtful prosecution of the subject. We shall not insult him by supposing that he belongs to the silly crowd, still too large, who think the question raised by Mr. Mill one to be dismissed by monkey-like caricatures and miserable jibes. It remains, and will not be disposed of, till the ripest judgment and purest conscience have been brought to its determination. But it will strike every impartial observer, as it strikes us, that the question raised is really a compound or multiform one, and that without waiting till we are agreed upon some abstract formula—such as the right of women to do, if they can, whatever men are now permitted to do—there are inequalities which may, by a general consensus of opinion, be removed without delay, and grievances which ought at once to be swept into the limbo of banished abuses. Here, indeed, our main objection to Mr. Mill's method demands expression—that he has argued an abstract thesis rather than pleaded for practical reforms. His thesis is, in effect, 'The subjection of women ought not in any shape or degree to exist'; but it would have been more to his ultimate purpose, and a greater help to the reader's understanding of the subject, had he begun with showing the forms which this subjection takes, and the evils which, in detail, each of the forms can be proved to generate or aggravate. The evils having been made apparent, the call for assistance in the removal of the special causes would have fitly followed; and some clue would have then been afforded to the order in which it is desirable to proceed in the progress of reform. Mr. Mill does not expect society to start from a theory of a perfect equality of the sexes: that, if ever arrived at, will be

the formal conclusion of a series of experiments showing that woman is entitled to do what is best for herself in the school and arena of life. Any theory about equality is, in reality, rather a drawback than an auxiliary at this stage of the movement on behalf of woman: for who can determine whether the sum of woman's capacity is ever equal at any one time to man's?—and apart from any question of mental equality, she has rights the exercise of which law and social opinion ought not to obstruct, but to sanction and facilitate. Neither is it necessary to prove that she is equal to all situations and responsibilities, in order to show that she is equal to much from which she is now precluded. The law needs not define, nor wait till men and women have defined, what degree of connubial power they shall respectively have in the settlement of disputed points, before it proceeds to blot out those monstrous grievances from which woman suffers—not because of mental weakness, but from her inferior physical strength. Had Mr. Mill pursued an analytic method, we should have received from him a greater number of valuable suggestions, and he would have aroused in the minds of even sympathetic readers fewer emotions of dissent. Mr. Mill aims to be scrupulously clear and exact, and that he succeeds in an extraordinary degree is known to all who peruse his writings; but we have wondered while reading this essay at the inordinate value which is placed upon a change of law by one who insists, as much as any contemporary writer, upon the efficiency of individual influence. The promise which a woman makes when married to 'obey' her husband is treated by Mr. Mill as a sort of legal charm, which operates to subject her at all times, and on all subjects, to the will of her legal lord, consulting his pleasure only or mainly, and subordinating all her efforts to the one all-comprehensive purpose of making the best of a very bad bargain. But is married life in England cast in such a mould? Do husbands exact obedience as lords? and do wives render it as subjects? Mr. Mill admits that men do not generally use the power the law gives them; and if they tried to use it, we may add, the women would not let them. There is, we own, much brutality on the part of men, and very much tyranny of a petty yet wearing kind; but this is rarely if ever exhibited *because* it is known to be according to law; the worst excesses are known to be otherwise; and we cannot perceive how any change of law, by relieving brides from the spoken pledge to obey their bridegrooms, could materially mend the matter. Bad men and women make bad husbands and wives, and will do so whatever theory is uppermost concerning the sexes;

and that man, we think, can have had small insight into the private life of our countrymen who does not admit that the happiness of home depends on affections, habits, tastes, and an adjustment of dispositions over which no theory of con-nubial equality can exercise a perceptible effect. Mutual love is the great sweetener, purifier, and beautifier of the married life; it is a power which leaves the law of force nothing but the name; and where it is absent, whether the law of the land recognises man's authority and woman's subjection, or not, there will be contention and every evil work. All this being true, however, it is none the less desirable that married women should obtain all such protection and command over their property as may, where they are badly mated, preserve them against the grosser abuses of superior strength. The bill brought into Parliament in the last Session by Mr. Russell Gurney will soon become law, and will be followed by other legislation for which a good case can be made out. There are bad wives, however, as well as bad husbands, and legislation will be required to guard men, as far as law can do, against the otherwise ruinous consequences of their frail partners' excesses.

An increasing friendliness is also manifest by society to measures for enlarging the sphere of female industry and talent. Mr. Mill lays comparatively small stress upon the admission of women to public offices, to some of which they would be scarcely likely to aspire. For some others they are eminently fit; and we may confidently look for a growing liberality of sentiment that will enable many trials to be made where statute law interposes no impediments. Unmarried women above age, and widows, have already a wide field for their exertions in business of all kinds, and in some of the more elegant occupations. Domestic service is filled with the sex; and so far as subjection is concerned, it would be difficult to prove that except in married life, to which we have adverted, and in some of the professions and political offices, women have to profess or learn lessons of submission from which men are free. In household arrangements they both reign and govern. They train their children and command their servants, often male ones. When, unmarried or widowed, they embark in business, they do as they please with their property; and in the cultivation of the fine arts they may go on, as quickly as possible, to perfection. In some respects it is more sympathy, and not more independence, that they chiefly call for and would mainly prize. We cannot make up our minds that throwing open to them all the pursuits of men, or proclaiming them equal in all respects to their masculine rivals,

would produce either the individual or social results predicted by Mr. Mill; yet we heartily rejoice to see that society is preparing to redress the wrongs they have endured, and to give heed to that assertion of their rights which they and their advocates make on their behalf. We re-echo Mr. Mill's appeal to men to take up their sisters' cause, and to render it early and generous help; nor must we fail to call upon women themselves to unite for objects they approve, in which the advantage of their sex is materially involved. They cannot in any other way more nobly repel and refute the charge, that they are naturally unfitted or indisposed to take part in public movements demanding comprehensiveness of mind and perseverance of endeavour.

---

#### REPORT OF CONVOCATION ON INTEMPERANCE.

If it be said that he who moves the clergy moves the world, this may be viewed either as a compliment to the office of the minister of religion, or the reverse, according to the standpoint occupied. That the heralds of the Cross should also be the heralds of every social reform demanding self-denial and a holy courage, is certain; and that if they fulfilled their function to the full, they would always be in the van of the army of social progress, and so have the whole world of motion following them, is also certain. To move them, therefore, would be to move the world, and to admit this would amount to a high compliment on the position occupied by the clergy. If, however, on the other hand, they choose to be, not in the van, but in the rear of the army; or, to vary the figure, to constitute the tail of the community, instead of being at its head; still it might be true that to move them would be to move that huge beast, the world, on the principle of tail-wringing, too well known to cruel drovers. Now, whether the clergy of the Church of England in this respect have placed themselves so as to be the head, or form the tail, it would ill become the politeness of *Meliora* to pronounce; and she is thus spared the necessity of considering what process might be proper for producing the indispensable movement,—whether persuasion to the head, or wringing and screwing at the other extremity. By one process or the other, the thing is now done; and we are very much

pleased to be able to announce to the world at large, that the clergy are actually moving.

The proof of it is before us. The 'Report by the Committee on Intemperance for the Lower House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury' is here, a goodly tome, actually printed and circulated by order of the Lower House. The book contains also copious appendices, and is in every respect a noteworthy and valuable volume.

It seems that a committee was appointed, and afterwards re-appointed, in pursuance of the directions of His Grace the President, and their Lordships the members of the Upper House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, 'To consider and report on the prevalence of intemperance, the evils which result therefrom, and the remedies which may be applied.' It is the report, thus authorised, that the Lower House has adopted and ordered to be circulated. The members of the committee were:—The Prolocutor, the Deans of Canterbury, Chichester, and Westminster, the Archdeacons of Coventry, Ely, Exeter, Leicester, Nottingham, and Salop, Canons Argles, Carus, Gillett, Harvey, Oxenden, Wood, and Dr. Fraser, and Prebendaries Gibbs and Kemp. The chairman of the committee was the Venerable Archdeacon Sandford of Coventry.

The inquiry was entered upon from no shallow impulse, and was shut up within no contracted range. As its subject most deeply and vitally affects the material condition and the moral and spiritual life of the people of this country, so the committee sought to deal with it, as bearing this commensurately in mind. They sent out letters of inquiry profusely to all parts of the twenty-one dioceses in the Province of Canterbury, embracing thirty-two English counties, besides Wales, North and South, with a population of between fourteen and fifteen millions of people. To the parochial clergy these letters were sent, of course; but not to them only. As far as possible, also, medical and other sources of information were communicated with in all the parishes, including persons of every class whose position or practical experience could entitle their evidence to most weight. To the governors and chaplains of prisons, to the heads of constabulary, to the superintendents of lunatic asylums, to the judges, recorders, coroners, and the masters of workhouses, forms of inquiry were transmitted; and the bounds of the province were transcended in some directions, so as to reach to the asylums, and to the judicial personages of all England and Wales, and to the constabulary throughout Great Britain. Moreover, in various parts of the country

enlightened and benevolent proprietors of territory or works have been consulted. Thus the utmost respect is due to the inquiry, as far as regards its outreach and scope ; and the report resulting from it is entitled to be regarded as expressing the judgment not alone of the parochial clergy of the province, but also collaterally of persons of intelligence and experience throughout the realm.

The evidence thus collected shows, in the first place, that whilst the evil of social intemperance has of late years greatly diminished in the upper and middle ranks of society, no corresponding improvement has occurred amongst the labouring classes ; that thus drinking prevails to a frightful extent in our commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural districts, and in the army and navy ; and this, not alone amongst men, but amongst women, and not only with adults, but with the young also. In many parts of the country the evil begins at a very early age, and youths and children are amongst its victims. Of the clergy returns before the committee, one speaks of intemperance as beginning 'early ;' one, at nine years of age ; eight at twelve to fourteen years ; one at thirteen ; seventeen at fourteen ; twenty-nine at fifteen ; forty-eight at sixteen ; forty-three at seventeen ; ninety-seven at eighteen ; and only eight at twenty to thirty. 'It begins with their boyhood and grows with their growth,' says one. 'At the first harvest after they go out to work,' says another. 'As soon as they go to work in the hayfield,' says a third. 'About the time the lads enter into the club,' says a fourth. 'From childhood,' says a fifth. 'It is almost impossible,' another says, 'to find out the earliest age at which it begins ; in some cases, it is to be feared, at a very early age indeed.' Another writes that 'boys seem to inherit it from their parents.' 'I have known a boy who worked for me steal money to spend in drink,' writes another. Another testifies that 'boys of fourteen have been made drunk by beer given them in the stocking-frame shops and the field.' Another, that 'lads of fourteen years of age may be seen, alas ! on Saturday nights, after receiving their fortnightly pay from the works, in a state of intoxication.' Another says, 'I believe children are speedily drifted into intemperance, and that publicans encourage them. I have seen in a public-house on Sundays a room lined all round with boys of from twelve to sixteen drinking.' Still another : 'As soon as the lads can earn anything, they are, I know, enticed into the public-houses or beershops, to smoke and drink, and become reprobates very soon.' 'Say twelve,' says still another ; 'the statutes settle this point very young. Boys and girls get drunk, debauchery and

defilement are the results.' And from governors of work-houses comes also corroborative evidence with regard to the growth of intemperance amongst women and girls.

Foremost among the direct causes of the evil, the committee place the Beer Act of 1830, which gave licensing power to the Excise; a power that an act of the late Session of Parliament has happily taken away. 'The testimony on this point,' says the committee, alluding to the evils of the beerhouse system, 'on the part of the magistracy, the constabulary, the parochial clergy, and other persons most competent to judge, is most emphatic and unanimous.' But beershops were called into existence, as the committee very justly adds, 'to correct mischief already deemed intolerable, resulting from the licensed public-houses and shops of the country, so that the beershops only aggravated an existing malady.' 'It also appears,' say the committee, 'an unquestionable fact that in proportion as facilities *in any shape* for procuring intoxicating liquors are countenanced and afforded, the vice of intemperance and its dismal effects are everywhere increased. That this would be the case has been continually maintained by members of the community desirous of the repression of intemperance, and extensively acquainted with its phases and workings. *This conclusion the evidence before your committee amply confirms.*' 'Your committee therefore wish to record, as their deep and rooted conviction, that the multiplied and increasing facilities for obtaining intoxicating liquor, provided by the law, are so many licensed temptations to the excess so frightfully prevalent and working such dire and disastrous results amongst our people.' The attractions of these facilities have been much augmented during the last fifty years by the addition of singing and dancing saloons, besides gaudy gin-palaces and ubiquitous beershops, that have been multiplied with terrible rapidity. Men of wealth, position, and influence have developed an ever-increasing interest in the consumption of intoxicating drinks; large capitalists own public-houses let at high rents, and compel their tenants to resort to all sorts of inducements to cultivate drinking habits amongst the people. Even prostitution is catered for by many keepers of beershops and low public-houses with this view, and 'thousands of young persons are in this way enticed to their ruin.' The licensing law, so full of anomalies, so variously administered, its restrictions so continually set at nought, and its violations so seldom punished, adds to the evil. 'With a system so faulty,' say the committee, 'a law so loosely and irregularly applied, and such abundant and increasing encouragements to intemperance, the spread of

this vice throughout the country cannot be a matter of surprise.'

Turning to indirect causes of the evil, the committee allude to various trade and social usages known to act as temptations and incitements to intemperance ; such are, the conducting of bargains, making of payments, and transacting business at public-houses; the part-payment of wages in drink ; the custom of paying 'footings' in drink ; the circulation of drink at auction sales ; the giving of gratuities in drink or for drinking ; and the practice of drinking at marriages, christenings, and other festive occasions, and at funerals. Stress is laid on the noxious tendency of holding benefit and other clubs at public-houses ; and on the connection of drinking customs with mops and fairs, with tithe dinners, and even with the belfries of churches. 'The vicious arrangement' at inns and hotels is pointed out, 'by which commercial travellers are induced to order and drink large quantities of wine for the good of the house, a custom often fatal to the integrity and health of the persons so affected.' After these come the billeting of soldiers and militiamen at public-houses, the supply of grog to soldiers and sailors, the encouragement given to intoxication in connection with recruiting practices, the adulteration of liquors, and the neglect of duty by the police. On almost all these heads evidence is printed in the appendix to the report.

And here, in due order, should have been inserted some reference, afterwards supplied, to the unwise prescription of alcoholic drinks by medical men, as tending very largely to the promotion of intemperance. A coroner writes that 'the physicians of the present day who prescribe such a large and unnecessary amount of stimulants are by no means to be exempted from blame in this matter.' The superintendent of an asylum alludes to 'the almost indiscriminate exhibition of stimulants which is too much the fashion among medical men at the present day, a fashion which I consider most pernicious, both morally and physically, but which, like other fashions, will probably have its day, though its effects will last for more than a generation.' 'My experience,' writes another gentleman filling a similar position, 'is that of the leading physicians of the day, viz., that the total disuse of alcohol, and the substitution of beef-tea and milk, constitute the best possible treatment—rest of body, and rest of mind, are, of course, essential to the cure ; but the old belief that alcoholic stimulants could not be withdrawn altogether without danger to the patient, has been generally abandoned.' And the evidence of a very large number of governors of gaols and workhouses

and chaplains of prisons is quoted afterwards, to show that the health of persons suddenly compelled to abstain from these drinks invariably improves.

In the great apple districts, cider appears again and again as the worst enemy of the labourer, who receives no mean part of his wages in that useless and deleterious liquid. ‘The practice which prevails at harvest,’ says a coroner, ‘of giving labourers a quantity of drink as an inducement to greater exertion, is very much to be deprecated. Labourers, naturally enough, think if their masters will furnish them with a quantity of drink for their own purpose, they may exceed now and then on their own account.’ The governor of a workhouse states that the farmers in his locality—an apple-growing one—pay very low wages, but indulge their labourers throughout the summer with an unlimited supply of cider; some with three or four gallons each per diem. ‘To this system may be attributed the great number of cases of dropsy, rheumatic affections, and more cases of lunacy than can be found in any other county with the same population; and it is chiefly with cases of this description that our workhouse is crammed.’ ‘After many years’ experience in my present position,’ he adds, ‘I cannot but feel convinced that cider is the curse of the county. The labourers should be paid in cash instead of cider.’ ‘The allowance of cider to a labourer at harvest time,’ says a clergyman, ‘is two gallons and a half a-day, and the result is that the state of semi-intoxication thus induced becomes habitual.’

Again, one clergyman states that ‘the annual club-feast teaches many to drink, and confirms them in drunkenness;’ another, that ‘the practice of benefit societies and friendly clubs meeting at public-houses, and charging each member for drink, is a cause of much mischief.’ ‘Much drunkenness is produced in this neighbourhood,’ says a third, ‘by the obliging of members of break-up clubs to spend a certain sum in beer on the monthly nights of payment at the village inn.’ And the governor of a workhouse says: ‘The regulated so-called benefit clubs or societies held at public-houses have been a snare and a delusion; disappointment and the workhouse have often been the result. I believe that nine out of ten of our aged inmates are in this case! ’

With reference to statutes and fairs, the Rev. Nash Stephenson, M.A., Vicar of Bromyard, supplies the following frightful paragraph:—

‘When the business of the day has drawn to a close, the *pleasures* of the evening commence. The inexperienced lad and lass, with the fruits of their last year’s labours in their pockets, are naturally led for the purposes of refreshment to the

neighbouring public-house. The place is filled to suffocation with visitors—all in the hey-day of youth—most without moral control, and all without the control of masters, or betters, or parents, or elders in life. To the stupefying effects of tobacco are added the intoxicating consequences of deleterious beer and spirits, and the maddening results of dancing and music. Each female selects her male companion for the evening, whose duty it is to see her to her distant home at the close of the amusements in the darkness of the night. Decency forbids me from entering into further details, and I cannot picture to you the proceedings of the night to its close.' 'The ordinary restraints of the lowest dregs of society are scarcely observed; and in the nineteenth century, and in civilised, enlightened, Christian England, scenes of iniquity may be witnessed that would defile and degrade the most debased of the heathen nations of the earth.'

Mr. Humphries, superintendent of police at King's Heath, after sixteen years' experience, says he 'believes statute-fairs to be one of the greatest evils in existence; he has seen married and single conducting themselves with the greatest impropriety, and young girls—or rather children—stopping all night, dancing and drinking, and allowing most indecent liberties to be taken with them.' Mr. Wild, superintendent of police at Solihull, after seventeen years' experience, declares that at these fairs 'young women stay late at the public-houses, become elated with drink, and hence a great deal of immorality on the road home.' Mr. Harris, inspector of police in Henley-in-Arden, says: 'I have had every opportunity of witnessing the demoralising effects of the statute-fairs in this neighbourhood, and have always considered the system bad in itself, as encouraging drunkenness and other crimes, and tending to the utter ruin of great numbers of the youth of both sexes.' The chief constable of Warwickshire says he has caused inquiries to be made throughout the county, and is informed by the officers that they are unanimously of opinion that statute-fairs are productive of a great amount of crime, drunkenness, and debauchery; and that on female servants they have a most baneful effect, many cases of bastardy having come under the notice of the police, resulting from improper intimacies at or returning from statutes. And the Right Honourable Lord Leigh, Lord Lieutenant of Warwickshire, says: 'The revolting appearance and openly impudent conduct of the young men and women whom I have met returning home after statute-fairs, have disgusted me to the highest degree, and when I met them at a tolerably early hour, and knew that they were only the forerunners of many who would be returning home in a more degraded condition still, and still later, I deeply regretted to think what the consequences must be to the morals and manners of the youth of our country.'

With regard to recruiting, Sir C. G. Trevelyan, K.C.B.,  
Vol. 12.—No. 47                      P

points out that the recruiting of the army is conducted entirely in public-houses, whereto the recruits are inveigled by 'bringers,' who are crimps of the worst description, touting about in all the lowest haunts of a town. The recruits are habitually plied with drink, and are generally under the influence of liquor when they enlist. They are also deceived by false expectations as to the amount of their remuneration, and are induced to make false representations as to their age and condition. As the recruiters are paid so much per head, they have a pecuniary interest in the gains of such objectionable practices. 'As soon,' Sir Charles Trevelyan says,

'As the recruits receive the bounty-money, their comrades get round them, and it is drunk away; so that the man not only gets drunk himself, but makes the men of his company drunk too, unless he keeps the money to enable him to desert, with a view of getting another bounty elsewhere. The recruiting sergeants, being lodged in the lowest houses in a town, where they meet only the lowest characters, become depraved; and even good non-commissioned officers, after having been employed on recruiting service, frequently return to their regiments dissipated in habits and appearance, and greatly in debt. . . . The head-money paid to recruiters is the immediate stimulus to the tipping and swindling of the recruiting system. . . . Of course, it is extremely difficult to keep together an army which has been got together by such an utterly immoral system of recruiting. . . . Recruiting should be dissociated from drunkenness by providing proper places in each district where the recruits may be received until they can be forwarded to the dépôt battalions. . . . A reference to the evidence will show how open we are to the reproach of tainting our soldiers at the outset of their career, and with that vice which is the cause of most of the crimes in the army, and of the flogging, branding, and other punishments which too often complete their demoralisation.'

On the score of adulteration, one clergyman reports that there is 'very little pure beer.' Another states that 'combined with the means used by publicans to excite men to gamble and spend their money on drink, is the salting of ale, which increases thirst.' Another alludes to 'the horrible beer, that is drugged to excite greater thirst, and so increase consumption.' Another writes: 'I found myself a large quantity of tobacco in the bottom of an old beer-cask, bought second-hand as a water-cask for my garden;' and another declares that 'tobacco is used in large quantities' for the purpose of adulteration. 'There is reason to believe,' says another reverend gentleman, 'that every barrel of beer is drugged more or less;' and another mentions *cocculus indicus*, as amongst other deleterious ingredients 'known' to be added to beer and ale. By another, the beer commonly drunk at public-houses is reported to be 'so bad that I would not drink a glass of it for a crown;' and by another, the climax perhaps is reached, when he says: 'The publicans adulterate fearfully. All sorts of filth, such as horse-flesh and tobacco, found at the bottom of the barrels when returned to the brewery.' The

general opinion of all the witnesses seems to be that the beer is thus made to have an extra thirst-producing instead of a thirst-quenching power; and that thus, as well as by vile mixtures that add to its natural exciting and stupefying effects, the increased consumption of the article, and the consequent increase of drunkenness are largely promoted. A coroner is struck by what he deems to be the fact that 'as a general rule the lower orders get intoxicated much more frequently, early, cheaply, and rapidly than they did in my early time; and I cannot but think that the impurity of the beer, now too generally retailed, has much to do with this, as well as with the great increase of insanity among the lower orders in country villages.'

The testimony is almost equally profuse with regard to the corruption of the police by the publicans. One clergyman writes: 'I have noticed that a new policeman is very sharp for the first few weeks with public-houses, but after that he lets them alone. I believe they are bribed in one way or the other, and thus shut their eyes to a great deal.' In connection with this, however, it might be stated with truth, that laxity in dealing with public-houses is often the result of the discovery the young policeman makes early, that the publicans have friends on the bench, and that other magistrates are very deficient in zeal for the proper punishment of public-house law-breakers. However, one clergyman declares that 'the publicans in too many cases buy over the police, who are afterwards afraid to inform against them.' 'There is no doubt,' another remarks, 'that the late alehouse is an almost unconquerable snare to the weary policeman.' 'Police,' writes another, 'connive at much that is wrong. If for awhile they stand firm against the temptation of having drink forced upon them by publicans and tipplers, they usually get into drinking ways at last. Several policemen have been appointed to this parish in the thirteen years of my ministry; nearly all have been sent away through the influence of drink directly or indirectly, and several of them dismissed from the force in consequence.' 'The whole of the evils,' says another reverend gentleman, 'are systematically winked at by the police, as they say they had better not be always interfering.' 'My opinion,' another says, 'is that the police are completely hoodwinked by the publican, and that it is only when the latter refuse black mail and get too outrageous that we have convictions. Police should not be left too long on one beat.' 'The police,' we are told by still another witness, 'are unnecessarily corrupted by the liquor-sellers. They are sometimes made drunk on

their beat by publicans.' Evidence to this effect is largely given in one of the appendices to the report of the committee.

From the causes of intemperance, the committee pass next to the results ;—'many of the crimes and miseries which disturb the peace of states and poison the happiness of families ;' the depravation of character, impairment of strength, shattering of health and nerves, and premature death of thousands ; the filling of prisons, workhouses, lunatic asylums, and penitentiaries ; and the prostration of the efforts and hopes of all who have at heart the elevation and welfare of the people. Amongst the usual products of intemperance are noted loss of health and intellect, decay of strength, most frightful diseases, and premature death ; the souring of the temper, the inflaming of the passions, the brutalisation of the whole nature ; no enormity of blasphemy in language, no turpitude of cruelty in action, to which drink will not incite even the naturally gentle and well conducted ; no family affections not blunted and obliterated ; no tender relations not outraged ; to gratify the craving for drink. And the sin of the parent is visited on a stunted, sickly, debilitated offspring. In no country, perhaps, is this vice so prevalent as our own. 'And unless remedies,' say the committee, 'be speedily and effectively supplied, consequences the most disastrous to us as a people cannot be long averted. No evil more nearly affects our national life and character ; none more vigorously counteracts the spiritual work of the Church ; and, therefore, no question more immediately demands the zeal of our clergy, the attention of our statesmen, the action of our Legislature, and the thoughtful aid of our philanthropists. Nor can any sacrifice be esteemed too costly, or any efforts too great, to check and remedy what may be shown by accumulated and undeniable evidence to be sapping the foundations of our prosperity, blighting the future and lowering the reputation of our country, and destroying at once its physical strength and its moral and religious life. In review of the inquiries of Parliament as to the evils caused by this vice, and the conclusive evidence laid before its committees, it is a matter of surprise to us that the Legislature has not long since interfered : and the statesman who should have magnanimity and moral courage to grapple with and wisdom to overcome this stupendous evil, would confer an incalculable benefit on his country, and establish a lasting claim to its gratitude.'

Of the intimate connection between intemperance and crime and pauperism, the committee treat at some length ; they show further what great injury to trade, what wilful waste of resources, what useless consumption of precious

grain, what terrible sacrifice of human life, besides what huge loss to the military and naval services, are attributable to strong drink. That intoxicating liquors may be suddenly and totally withdrawn, and the health be not injured but benefited, is proved by reference to the experience of prisoners and paupers. Lastly, in concluding their long and terrible indictment of the liquor traffic, the committee allude to the lowering of the national reputation, the outrages and injuries inflicted abroad on other peoples by British subjects, the obstacles interposed in the way of commerce and civilisation, ‘and above all the obstruction to that message of reconciliation and peace through heathen lands and Christendom itself, of which this nation might otherwise be the honoured emissary and agent.’

On the effect of intemperance on the work of the Church, the evidence, in an appendix to the report, is copious. ‘Habits of occasional intemperance,’ says one witness, ‘keep men away from church for a time.’ ‘The apparent result,’ another testifies, ‘is chiefly neglect of the means of grace and ordinances of religion.’ ‘Public-house keepers,’ says another, ‘rarely or never come to church.’ Another: ‘There are families who never attend Divine service; they plead that they have no decent clothes in which to come—the truth being that the money which should purchase clothes is spent at the beer-shop.’ Another: ‘Saturday night being the usual time for drinking-bouts, men feel themselves unfit in every way for attendance at church, and thus the Sunday morning congregations include but a small number of working men.’ Another: ‘All persons who frequent alehouses are irregular in their attendance at a place of worship.’ It might have been more correct to have said that most persons who frequent alehouses are regular in their non-attendance. Other witnesses say: ‘Many dare not face the pulpit.’ ‘Those who drink most worship least.’ ‘One public-house only; population, 280; since the opening of the public-house the attendance at church has been somewhat less.’ ‘Attendance at church has been greatly increased with the decrease of intemperance among my parishioners.’ Such are some of the testimonies cited by the committee on this head. Another witness says: ‘I speak clerically, and say that intemperance undoes all we can do for the moral improvement of the parish; and magisterially, that out of every 100 cases, 90 at least of the cases brought before the bench are directly or indirectly to be traced to intemperance; and perhaps (having been in practice for several years as a medical man, and holding my diploma) I may speak medically, that vice caused to a

great extent by intemperance, ruinously affects the health of numbers.' 'Intemperance,' says one clergyman, 'is very prejudicial to religion, more than any other cause, and is the secret source of backsliding among Christian converts.' 'People who indulge in drink,' says another, 'seem dead to religion.' 'Almost all that is wrong in the parish,' says another, 'wrong and irreligious, is traceable to drunkenness.' 'It is,' says another, 'a fearful drawback in morals and religion; it ruins my senior scholars awfully.' 'The clergy everywhere,' exclaims still another, 'but in our large towns especially, are discouraged, cast down, almost driven to despair through the universal prevalence of the vice (of drinking), and the temptations that are multiplied for its encouragement on every hand under the protection of law; it thwarts, defeats, and nullifies their Christian schemes and philanthropic efforts to such an extent, that it is becoming a matter of grave question whether infidelity, religious indifferences, and social demoralisation, are not making head against us in defiance of all our churches, our clergy, our Scripture readers, and our schools.'

Abundant as is the evidence on this head, it is exceeded in amount very largely indeed by the voluminous testimony of judges, recorders, police magistrates, and other competent authorities, showing the overwhelming pre-eminence of drinking amongst all the factors of crime. Lord Chief Justice Bovill writes to the chairman of the committee :

'I have no hesitation in stating that in the North of England, and in most of the large towns and the manufacturing and mining districts, intemperance is directly or indirectly the cause of by far the largest proportion of the crimes that have come under my observations. Amongst a large class of our population intemperance in early life is the direct and immediate cause of every kind of immorality, profligacy, and vice, and soon leads to the commission of crime. As the young of both sexes grow up, the habit of intoxication increases upon them, and inevitably leads to crimes of violence of the most serious description, including murders, manslaughter, rapes, robberies, and violent assaults. In many cases these crimes are committed by parties under the immediate influence of drink. In others, the fact of a man being intoxicated induces persons to take advantage of his state of helpless unconsciousness, and they afterwards escape punishment from the inability of the sufferer to identify his assailants, or to know, or remember, or to give evidence, of what has occurred. It is frequently very painful to find honest and well-disposed and hard-working men, who do not belong to the criminal class, placed in the dock for serious crimes committed under the influence of drink, and who, if they had been in possession of their senses, would never have thought of committing such crimes; and still more painful to a judge to have to sentence such men to long terms of imprisonment, to the ruin of themselves and families.'

\* The cost to the country for the maintenance of the prisoners and their families likewise becomes a matter of very serious importance; and—looking also to the wholesale misery that is brought upon the working classes by their indulging in intoxication, at first unsuiting them for their ordinary occupations and then rapidly causing disease and want, too frequently insanity or death, and bringing distress upon their families, and considering the amount of pauperism as well as

crime which is thus occasioned—it would seem to be the imperative duty, as well as the interest, of the State to endeavour to provide some remedy which will check so frightful an evil.'

Similar, though in many cases still more emphatic, testimony is given by a large number of witnesses, including governors and chaplains of gaols, chief constables, police superintendents, and persons of every class likely to be well informed on this momentous subject. One head of police, who attributes three-fourths of all crime to drink, says: 'I have now been altogether thirty years a police officer in different counties, and have had during that time some thousands of prisoners in my custody—a great many of them drunkards—but not one total abstainer from intoxicating drinks.' Another declares: 'The traffic in intoxicating drink is the great producer of crime. Scarce any crime is committed which may not be traced to that cause.'

A body of evidence, almost equally voluminous, shows the causal connection of intemperance with pauperism. 'I can trace nearly every case of family destitution to intemperance,' says a clergyman. 'There would be no real poverty here,' says a second, 'except from some illness, if there were no drunkenness.' 'As chairman of the Board of Guardians,' writes a third, 'I testify that intemperance adds considerably to the poor rate.' 'This Union,' writes a fourth, 'consisting of 80,000 persons, has to support 80 pauper lunatics, at a charge of £20 per annum each. About two-thirds of these cases have been traced to drink. Two or three cases of pauper lunacy occur every year.' According to one governor of a workhouse, 'eighty per cent. may be given as the proportion of paupers who are the victims of intemperance.' Varying the phrase, 'eighteen out of every twenty,' according to another. 'I have been master of a workhouse and relieving officer for eleven years, and during that time I never knew a teetotaler apply for parochial relief,' says a third; and a fourth says, 'I am sure I am within the mark when I say nine-tenths of the adult paupers are habitual drinkers to excess, and the children are nearly all paupers in consequence of the dissipated habits of their parents. The demoralising influence of intoxicating drinks I consider to be the most prolific cause of bastardy.' Another writes: 'All paupers who have come under my cognizance have more or less been the victims of intemperance. I have never known a pauper who was a total abstainer.' Another: 'An abstainer from drink has not been an inmate for the last twenty-one years that I have been master.' Another, who declares he is not a teetotaler, says: 'I could almost

say that every pauper inmate of a workhouse is made so directly or indirectly through intemperance.' Another: 'Drink is the most prominent curse of the land. Residence in a workhouse three months would convince any one.' Very few of the witnesses assign to drink less than two-thirds of the pauperism; and a large number of them give eighty, ninety, or a still higher percentage. 'It is a fact,' says a workhouse governor, 'that more extra labour will be done by a pauper for half-a-pint of beer than for sixpence. Beer is even a standard of value amongst the lowest class of poor. Such expressions as "the price of a pint," "worth a pot," "stood a gallon," are the usual modes of expressing value among the pauperised poor. Dangerous, indeed, must be that section of society (and it is a large one) whose standard of value is the pot of beer.'

With regard to the large amount of disease, lunacy, and sacrifice of life caused by drink, clergymen, superintendents of asylums, and coroners bear strong and conclusive witness. 'My parish,' one clergyman writes, 'exhibits a very high rate of mortality, chiefly among children, who are often born in an imperfectly organised condition, and badly nourished afterwards, in consequence of the intemperance of the parents. I am continually called upon to sign papers for lunatics through drink.' Another writes: 'I have been directing my attention for some years to the more permanent effects of drinking habits, as tending to produce a depraved or debilitated offspring, not only making the parents "*nequiores*," but "*mox datus progeniem vitiosiorem*." I have collected some very curious facts on this point tending to prove that not only lunacy, but also other obscure diseases of the brain, may be traced to intemperance of parents.' A superintendent of a lunatic asylum says: 'I never knew a lunatic patient who had been a total abstainer.' Another says: 'If it is understood as including all the results of intemperance, such as poverty, vice, domestic unhappiness, etc., the proportion of cases traceable to intemperance cannot, I think, be much under 50 per cent.' 'To these,' another writes, 'must be added an unascertainable number of idiots, imbeciles, etc., the offspring of intemperate parents, in whom the sins of the fathers are visited on the children. The deplorable fact still remains that a very large proportion of insanity is the immediate or direct result of intemperance.' Of violent and sudden deaths, according to many coroners who have been consulted, a very large proportion are stated to be directly or indirectly the results of intemperance. Other testimony shows clearly that 'drunkenness is *the vice of the army*'

Of course, the various witnesses, in response to the request for suggestions of remedies, sent in a copious variety, which are represented in detail in long appendices; from these the committee have selected those that they deem to be most important and are prepared to recommend as practicable. These divide themselves into the non-legislative, and the legislative. Of the first class, the list is as follows :—

‘ 1. The removal of benefit clubs from public-houses, and the holding of their meetings in schoolrooms, or, where obtainable, in rooms especially provided for recreation and instruction.

‘ 2. The discontinuance of the practice of paying wages or concluding bargains in public-houses, and the payment of wages on Friday, or early in the week, rather than on the Saturday when there is more opportunity for drinking.

‘ 3. The providing really good tea and coffee-rooms, where wholesome refreshment and other comforts may be enjoyed by the working classes at a cheap rate.

‘ 4. The encouragement of cottage allotments, night schools for adults, parochial libraries, workmen’s clubs, and social gatherings—whether for mutual instruction or amusement—in which kindly intercourse and sympathy between the different classes of society may be promoted.

‘ 5. More comfortable, commodious, and healthy dwellings for working men—implying an abundant supply of light, ventilation, and water—it being well known that a craving for intoxicating liquors is created and increased by the closeness, damp, and discomforts inseparable from the miserable and crowded apartments in which many of them lodge.

‘ 6. Above all, there must be education in its widest sense and practical bearings, and based on Divine revelation; which will implant principles and impart tastes that may serve to counteract and supersede the animal indulgence by which many are enslaved; and which ought to be supplemented, as far as possible, by special instruction on subjects bearing on domestic comfort and economy: on which points, it must be admitted, that hitherto our national system of education has been both inadequate and defective. What is required is an education, as described by one of our coroners, “of a far more universal, more common-place, common-sense character than anything this country has yet seen.” One of the most thoughtful and sober writers of our day speaks scornfully of mere teaching as “an empirical remedy” for intemperance. Another states, as a result of his pastoral experience, that “some of the best educated are the most drunken.” Even in highly civilised communities intemperance has been found commensurate with temptations to drink.

‘ The only education that can cope with these is one that shall cultivate not only the mind but the heart,—which “shall embrace the encouragement by every proper means of a love of home and home enjoyments—as the natural and proper counteraction of the seductions of the public-house—and the general dissemination among the people of sound information as to the actual effects of our drinking habits upon their moral, social, and physical condition.”

‘ It may be hoped that in proportion as such an education is brought more within the reach of our people—as its lessons are more adapted to their daily needs and daily duties—as it affords training in the principles of health and of social and domestic economy—those enjoyments may be found at home which are at present sought by so many in low haunts of dissipation. It is the testimony of one who has had ample means of judging, that “not one female in twenty, of our humbler classes, is instructed in the ordinary duties of either a wife or a mother.”

‘ In connection with such special teaching on the evils of intemperance—which your committee are of opinion ought to form a branch of education in all our schools—temperance societies, bands of hope, and young men’s associations are recommended by many of the clergy as having proved, in their experience, of signal benefit; while it is the almost universal testimony of those connected with our criminal jurisprudence and the control of workhouses,—and, indeed, of all who have looked deeply into the subject,—that in the case of persons addicted to

intemperance, total abstinence from intoxicating drinks is, under God, the only effectual remedy.'

Legislative remedies also are suggested by the committee; convinced, as they are, 'that without an improved and stringent system of legislation, and its strict enforcement, no effectual and permanent remedy for intemperance can be looked for.'

'1. The repeal of the Beer Act of 1830, and the total suppression of beer-houses throughout the country.

'2. The closing of public-houses on the Lord's day, except for the accommodation of *bond-side* travellers.

'3. The earlier closing of public-houses on week day evenings, in accordance with the practice now on the increase, of early closing in all other businesses. More especially is this necessary on Saturday when, it is well known, intemperance chiefly prevails.

'4. A great reduction in the number of public-houses throughout the kingdom, it being in evidence that the number already licensed far exceeds any real demand, and that in proportion as facilities for drinking are reduced, intemperance with its manifold evils is restrained.

'5. Placing the whole licensing system under one authority, and administering it on some uniform plan which would have for its object the abatement of existing temptations to tippling and intemperate habits.

'6. The rigid enforcement of the penalties now attached to drunkenness, both on the actual offenders and on licensed persons who allow drunkenness to occur on their premises.

'7. Passing an act to prevent the same person holding a music, dancing, or billiard licence, in conjunction with a licence for the sale of intoxicating drinks.

'8. Prohibiting the use of public-houses as committee rooms at elections, and closing such houses on the days of nomination and election in every Parliamentary borough.

'9. The appointment of a distinct class of police for the inspection of public-houses, and frequent visitation of public-houses for the detection of adulterations, to be followed, on conviction, by severe penalties.

'10. The repeal of all the duties on tea, coffee, chocolate, and sugar.

'11. Your committee, in conclusion, are of opinion that as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors is to supply a supposed public want, without detriment to the public welfare, a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licenses should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected—namely, the inhabitants themselves—who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system. Such a power would, in effect, secure to the districts, willing to exercise it, the advantages now enjoyed by the numerous parishes in the province of Canterbury where, according to reports furnished to your committee, owing to the influence of the landowner, no sale of intoxicating liquors is licensed.'

There still remains to be noticed a large collection of testimonies gathered from nearly fifteen hundred parishes in the province of Canterbury, the names of which are given, and wherein there is neither public-house nor beershop; 'and where,' as the committee remark, 'in consequence of the absence of those inducements to crime and pauperism, according to the evidence before the committee, the intelligence, morality, and comfort of the people are such as the friends of temperance have anticipated.' It is upon this list of parishes, and the reports sent in from observers on the spots, that the

committee have founded the last of their recommendations for legislative remedies,—identical, as our readers will have noticed, with the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill, of which Sir Wilfrid Lawson is the well-known and able champion in the House of Commons. Were we to cite half the evidence from those prohibitory parishes, it would occupy many of the pages of *Meliora*; who must therefore content herself with producing a few of the witnesses, leaving the rest,—all similar in their testimony,—to stand behind these invisibly, but capable of being produced in court at once by any judge who may think well to possess himself of one of the handsome but very low-priced volumes in which the report and the evidence in full are given.\*

'I can only say that the benefits of "no" public-house or beershop are very perceptible, especially when I compare the moral condition of this place with my other parish where there are a public-house and two beershops. Landlords are quite aware of the effects of beershops, as they seldom allow them to exist in parishes under their sole control, however some may support them in Parliament. Though there is no public-house here or near, no inconvenience is felt.'

'The public-house was done away with about eleven years ago, shortly before I became incumbent. I am assured that when there was a public-house it was the occasion of much intemperance, of much riot and disorder, and of much poverty and distress. The names of many men can be mentioned who spent the greater part of their earnings in drink, their wives and children suffering want in consequence. The peace and quiet of the village was disturbed by their drunken brawls, &c., while poaching and other offences were rife. From the experience of ten years' intercourse with the people and residence among them, I believe, I may confidently say that we have no habitual drunkard. I do not remember to have seen a parishioner in a state of intoxication more than once or twice, and the freedom of the village from those riots and disorder which are, perhaps, inseparable from a public-house is very observable and often spoken of with satisfaction.'

'I have no hesitation in saying that the abolition of the public-house has been a great boon and an unmixed benefit to the place. It has contributed very decidedly to the well being of the labouring inhabitants; and I am moreover confident that no real practical inconvenience has been experienced from its abolition.'

'When I entered upon my duties I found in this parish a public-house,—and it was a great nuisance, being chiefly supported by poachers and other unruly persons,—and subsequently, upon undertaking the duties of the adjoining parish, I found another of the same description, and with much difficulty I got rid of both, and have hitherto prevented having a beerhouse in either; and the result is that I have no drunkenness or disorder, and my people soon found out the comfort. I thank God my efforts have received their reward, and as long as I can preserve my influence there shall be neither public-house, beershop, nor ginshop in either of my parishes.'

'I beg to state that the fact of there being no public-house in my parish has, in my opinion, been productive of great advantage. Though the wages are only the average wages of an agricultural labourer, the people are, as general rule, better off and more comfortable in their homes than in a parish where an alehouse is at hand. . . . Besides, speaking generally, they are all well disposed on religious matters, some, of course, more than others; but all attend Divine service, and the majority of them regularly. I have not, for some years, heard of occasional intoxication. A riotous disturbance is a thing almost unknown.'

\* Report by the Committee on Intemperance, &c. London: Longman, Green, Reade, & Dyer.

'Many years ago there was a beerhouse here in which the young men used to meet and get drunk. Many complaints having been made, and every effort made to stop the evil, the beershop was turned into a cottage. There is now no drunkenness nor disorderly conduct. Comparing this parish with two in which I was curate, and where there are beershops, I can without statistics, positively state that this is by far the most orderly and religious parish of the three.'

'I used some years ago to think that it was a bad thing for the village having no public-house or beershop in it, for I thought men would have beer (even those who were not drunkards), and that when they had walked a mile or a mile and a half for it they were tempted to stay longer and drink more than they would have, could they have got some beer at home. And at that time I was almost in favour of having either public-house or a beershop under strict regulations; but I have quite altered my mind, and got to think that it is a blessing being without one; for I feel sure if we had a public-house in the place our people would lounge into it on an evening. . . . As it is, we have no such thing as drunkenness in the place.'

'No kind of intoxicating drink is in use in the parish, with rare exceptions. Our miners generally use weak tea with their meals; and except on holidays there is very little drinking, and even then, only by persons who are not at all respected. For several years I have not seen a man under the influence of drink. There is a large, I may say a crowded, attendance at church. There is very little of what comes under the head of crime, and no case of lunacy in the parish. Our communicants, although not pledged, are practical teetotalers; the members of the New Connexion Methodists are pledged teetotalers, and most of the members of the Wesleyan Society are, like the Church people, practical though not pledged teetotalers.'

'I am happy to state that I consider it has been unquestionably of the greatest possible benefit in a moral, social, and religious point of view, that we have no public-house or beershop. The farmers and myself always firmly and resolutely oppose every attempt to introduce the opening of any such house; and, although there is no public-house or beershop within two miles, none of the inhabitants have ever complained that they suffer any inconvenience.'

'For eighteen years I have been rector of this parish,—my predecessor thirty-eight years,—and not a single instance of drunkenness has occurred—say for the last fifty-six years; not one of the parishioners has been brought before a magistrate. I attribute this influence for good to the absence of public-houses and beershops.'

'It is now four and a half years since our only public-house was burnt down, and it has not been rebuilt. We have cause to congratulate ourselves on this circumstance. It was a resort for poachers and other bad characters in the neighbourhood, who now seek shelter and protection from no one in this parish. It was a great snare to the young, who now, for the most part, attend night school, or stay at home, seldom liking the trouble to walk over a mile to a public-house. I have never seen a drunkard in the place. It is hardly possible to estimate the advantage accurately.'

'During the five and a half years I have had charge of the parish, I have never seen a drunken man or woman; nor have I, save in one instance, had occasion to admonish any of my parishioners upon the sinfulness of the degrading vice of intemperance. The case to which I refer was that of a man whose work lies in the neighbouring town, where he is of course exposed to temptation. I firmly believe that in the case of drunkenness, prevention is better than cure. My people do not care to walk a mile and a half off to the nearest public-house.'

'There is neither public-house nor beershop, and comparatively little drunkenness, except when carters or others go into market towns, when there have been cases of being overtaken. . . . The people are generally healthy, well clothed, and comfortably off. The attendance at church good. My other parish has two beershops with licences not to be drunk on the premises. I cannot in any respect speak so satisfactorily respecting this as the other. Both in a temporal and spiritual point of view, the effect of these beerhouses is bad, and I should be very glad on every ground if some alteration in the law could abate the present unsatisfactory state of things.'

'We have no real poverty in the parish, the labourers are in constant work—have well-furnished cottages—and spend their evenings at home; and though I have had charge of the parish for more than eight years, I do not remember having seen a case of intoxication in it. These advantages I have no doubt arise in some measure, at least, from the fact that we have no public-house or beershop in the parish.'

'It is with the sincerest thankfulness to the Giver of All Good that I can state that the advantages have been great in our case. . . . During the eighteen years I have been in this parish, the health of the people has been unusually good.

. . . There has not been one serious injury in it during the whole period. The morals of the people are so free from any gross stains that I am at times afraid of their suffering spiritually from their thinking too highly of themselves. They furnish no cases for the parish constable or policeman. Men working on the roads leave their tools by the wayside when they return home for the night, without any fear of not finding them there in the morning. The people, without exception, are decently clothed, and there has been no case of insolvency since I came here. By applying to landowners, I have succeeded in persuading them to suppress three beershops in neighbouring parishes, and prevented the establishment of another which was attempted. There are, therefore, now four contiguous parishes here without public-houses; and very favourably can I report of those with which I am not officially connected. The improvement which results from the absence of these temptations in our parish extends into other parishes around it, and the change in the last eighteen years for miles round is very evident. . . . I have ministered in large towns, and know something of the sins and sorrows that abound there through this one cause. If this evil could be suppressed, what might we not expect the influence of Britain to be upon the world!'

'You have been rightly informed that there are no public-houses or beershops here. Only very occasionally any inconvenience is felt, and the benefit to the people in the place is felt and acknowledged by all. The village is orderly and quiet, and only once during my incumbency of six years have I seen a drunken parishioner. Indeed drunkenness is hardly known. The labourer is too tired of an evening to go two miles in quest of beer. . . . This sobriety has a great effect upon the harmony and comforts of home. Every labourer is able to keep a pig, and several have cows. They are able to keep their children at school longer than usual. They belong, as a rule, both men and women, to some friendly society. I know something of their private concerns. One day-labourer, a butcher, has saved £70. Another, a shepherd, has laid by over £100. Only last week a labourer, with a family of five children, consulted me as to an investment for his savings. This humble prosperity is not confined to one or two instances, but is fully evenly spread over the whole place. In the interest of truth, I am bound to add, that the parish belongs to Lord —, who is a resident here most part of the year, and that he takes an interest in the concerns of almost every parishioner. But after deducting the effect of this influence upon the welfare of the place, I can fairly attribute very much of the prosperity and morality to the absence of public-houses. I may add, I have heard frequently the men and women express their thankfulness that the temptation to drinking has been taken out of the way.'

The volume before us is evidently the result of vast labour, and not a little expenditure of money, in obtaining, arranging, and printing the evidence; and the arduous task of obtaining the committee in the first instance, then of preparing its report, and of securing for it the approval and endorsement of the Lower House of Convocation, must have been prodigious. For this, the thanks of every lover of temperance, and indeed of every friend of the human race, are largely due, under God, to the Ven. Archdeacon Sandford, whose name is appended to the very modest preface introducing the volume.

## DR. LYMAN BEECHER'S 'SIX SERMONS.'

**D**R. BEECHER was certainly a remarkable man. His portrait represents a most earnest and ardent character, one of the genuine seed of the Puritans, with an entire preservation of their creed, character, spirit, prejudices, powers, merits, and faults. He was, like them, vehement to fury, zealous to slaying, intense to narrowness, but full of faith and burning earnestness, and his hatred, like that of the best of men, might be called inverted love. As a preacher of extreme Calvinism he was one of the most uncompromising, powerful, and overwhelming. Yet his sincerity and simplicity of character saved him, to a great extent, from the charge of fanaticism, and those who heard him and did not believe his doctrine, were yet awestruck by his holiness and penetrated by his philanthropy, and while they were not converted to the creed, they were taught to revere and to love the man. A notable instance of this is found in the case of the late Theodore Parker. That in some points erroneous, but in all points earnest, and in many respects most noble and gifted man, attended Dr. Beecher's ministry for a long time; and although the doctor's sermons and arguments and thundering denunciations, instead of producing conviction in his mind of the Calvinistic creed, made him to recoil from it more and more, partly perhaps on the principle that the inhabitants of the tropics are less afraid of thunder, where it is common and tremendous, than the inhabitants of temperate climes, where it is moderate and unfrequent, yet he never ceased to love and admire the preacher. He learned earnestness, if not theology, from his lips, and he learned, too, charity, since he saw that here one of the best of men held doctrines which made him shudder and recoil at times with horror. We have not Parker's life at hand, but we may refer our readers to it as containing one of the most remarkable testimonies of respect from an honest and able rationalist to an honest and able preacher of the Orthodox doctrines.

Dr. Beecher's Six Sermons on Intemperance filled, we believe, the first book that gained him a name in Great Britain. We remember reading them when a boy, and being greatly struck with their exceeding energy of style, boldness of imagery, pungency of illustration, and earnestness of tone. Intemperance at that time, still more than now, the great moral mischief of America, had exerted almost a fascinating

and fearful influence on Dr. Beecher's imagination. It seemed to him a black shadow breathed up from the pit and darkening earth below and beclouding heaven above; it rested like a nightmare upon the breast of his country; it sacrificed manly enterprise; it crushed manly energy; it withered manly health; it deadened religious enterprise; it formed a cloud between the Mercy-seat above and the Church of Christ below; it seemed the sum of all the evils of humanity, the masterstroke of demoniac skill and infernal ingenuity; the one great obstacle which prevented the earth from attaining the climax of true happiness, and Christianity the culmination of its triumph. All this, and more than this, Dr. Beecher enumerated with vast force of conviction, intensity of feeling, and power of language. One passage especially we remember well, in which he described the earth as the vast whispering gallery repeating the woes and horrors of intemperance, as peculiarly powerful and striking to young imaginations.

'Oh! were the sky over our heads one great whispering gallery, bringing down about us all the lamentation and wo which intemperance creates, and the firm earth one sonorous medium of sound, bringing up around us from beneath the wailings of the damned whom the commerce in strong drink had sent thither, these tremendous realities, assailing our sense, would invigorate our conscience, and give decision to our purpose of reformation. But these evils are as real as if the stone did cry out of the wall, and the beam answered it; as real as if day and night wailings were heard in every part of the dwelling, and blood and skeletons were seen upon every wall; as real as if the ghostly forms of departed victims flitted about the ship as she passed over the billows, and showed themselves nightly about stores and distilleries, and with unearthly voices screamed in our ears their loud lament. They are as real as if the sky over our heads collected and brought down about us all the notes of sorrow in the land, and the firm earth should open a passage for the wailings of despair to come up from beneath.'

There are, and were then, other evils besides intemperance—some of them perhaps even greater, because more respectable and insidious, and warring still more against the soul. There are selfishness, trade trickery, and falsehood, and, besides, uncharitableness, licentiousness, ungodliness, calumny, and evil-speaking were then, and are still, prevalent, and are eating like cankers into the very heart and core of society. But Dr. Beecher, viewing intemperance as one great form of iniquity, and anxious for its abolition, might well be excused for neglecting to allude for the moment to those other shapes of evil, and concentrating his whole energy of attack upon this. Besides, he felt, as all reformers do, that in order to gain a point that point must be magnified. In order to destroy an evil that evil must be regarded through a powerful telescope. In order to carry a citadel that citadel must be insulated and made the principal aim of the beleaguering

cannon. And on this hint he spake, and his word both in America and here was with power.

Dr. Beecher's sermons were six in number, and were devoted to the nature, occasions, signs, evils, and remedies of intemperance. All of them were eminently practical in their cast, and yet at the same time glowed with eloquence, palpitated with earnest feeling, and glittered with poetical imagery. They were delivered in Lichfield in 1826, and he might be considered as almost the father of the movement in America; a movement which undoubtedly has been productive of an immense amount of good. His sermon on the remedies is exceedingly earnest, and has much that was and is seasonable about it, although some may think that it does not lay sufficient stress upon the gradual effects of culture, good manners, sanitary regulations, increased material comfort, and religious influences as striking at the roots of intemperance. Dr. Beecher's *brochure* is by no means to be regarded as a complete, a final, a philosophical defence of its own cause. It lies open to various and obvious objections. It overstates some things, understates others; but as a first trumpet blast, calling attention to the subject, and proclaiming the evils of a great and growing abuse, it did its work, and will ever deserve its high meed of applause.

We notice some little blunders in these sterling sermons. For instance, he says, p. 16, 'The giant writers of Scotland are some of them men of *threescore and ten*, who still go forth to the sports of their youthful days with undiminished activity.' We smile at this, remembering that in 1826 the two principal writers in Scotland were Sir Walter Scott and Professor Wilson—the one of them then 55, and the other 41 years of age,—and that Scott died when 61. Probably Beecher was thinking of the imaginary age which Christopher North always, in *Blackwood*, attributed to himself. But certainly the Scottish authors as a rule, if they have lived long, have not done so owing to their peculiar temperance; nor do we remember any instances of great longevity among them, unless it be in the case of George Buchanan and Henry Mackenzie—Buchanan being 79 and Mackenzie 86 when they respectively died. But it will not do to look at these sermons in a carping spirit. They are productions superior to petty criticism, powerful, fresh, dipped in the heart's blood of their author, and animated by a spirit of the most glowing philanthropy.

We quote, in addition to the passage already given, one or two of the more sterling portions:—

From the first sermon we give the following passage:—

'The use of these liquors, employed as an auxiliary to labour, is among the most fatal, because the most common and least suspected, causes of intemperance. It is justified as innocent, it is insisted on as necessary; but no fact is more completely established by experience, than that it is utterly useless, and ultimately injurious, beside all the fearful evils of habitual intemperance to which it so often leads. THERE IS NO NUTRITION IN ALCHOLIC LIQUOR. ALL THAT IT DOES IS, TO CONCENTRATE THE STRENGTH OF THE SYSTEM FOR THE TIME BEYOND ITS CAPACITY FOR REGULAR EXERTION. It is borrowing strength for an occasion which will be needed for futurity, without any provision for payment, and with the certainty of ultimate bankruptcy.

'The early settlers of New England endured more hardship, and performed more labour, and carried through life more health and vigour, than appertains to the existing generation of labouring men. And they did it without the use of intoxicating drinks.

'Let two men of equal age and firmness of constitution, labour together through the summer, the one with, and the other without the excitement of these liquors, and the latter will come out at the end with unimpaired vigour, while the other will be comparatively exhausted. Ships navigated, as some now are, without the habitual use of ardent spirits, and manufacturing establishments carried on without it, and extended agricultural operations, all move on with better industry, more peace, more health, and a better income to the employers and employed. The workmen are cheerful and vigorous, friendly and industrious, and their families are thrifty, well-fed, well-clothed, and instructed; and instead of distress, and poverty, and disappointment, and contention, they are cheered with the full flow of social affection, and often by the sustaining power of religion. But where strong drink is received as a daily auxiliary to labour, it is commonly taken at stated times: the habit soon creates a vacancy in the stomach, which indicates at length the hour of the day with as much accuracy as a clock. It will be taken, besides, frequently at other times, which will accelerate the destruction of nature's healthful tone, create artificial debility, and the necessity of artificial excitement to remove it; and when so much has been consumed as the economy of the employer can allow, the growing demand will be supplied by the evening and morning dram from the wages of labour, until the appetite has become insatiable, and the habit of intemperance nearly universal; until the nervous excitability has obliterated the social sensibilities, and turned the family into a scene of babbling and wo; until voracious appetite has eaten up the children's bread, and abandoned them to ignorance and crime; until conscience has become callous, and fidelity and industry have disappeared, except as the result of eye service; and wanton wastefulness, and contention, and reckless wretchedness, characterise the establishment.'

In the second occurs a short but striking passage:—

'It is here, then, beside this commencing vortex, that I would take my stand, to warn off the heedless navigator from destruction. To all who do but heave in sight, and with voices that should rise above the winds and waves, I would cry, "Stand off! spread the sail, ply the oar, for death is here!" and could I command the elements, the blackness of darkness should gather over this gateway to hell, and loud thunders should utter their voices, and lurid fires should blaze, and the groans of unearthly voices should be heard, inspiring consternation and flight in all who came near. For this is the parting point between those who forsake danger, and hide themselves, and the foolish who pass on, and are punished. He who escapes this periodical thirst of times and seasons, will not be a drunkard, as he who comes within the reach of this powerful attraction will be sure to perish. It may not be certain that every one will become a sot; but it is certain that every one will enfeeble his body, generate disease, and shorten his days. It may not be certain that every one will sacrifice his reputation, or squander his property, and die in the almshouse; but it is certain that a large proportion will come to poverty and infamy of those who yield daily to the periodical appetite for strong drinks. Here is the stopping place, and though beyond it men may struggle, and retard,

and modify their progress, none, comparatively, who go by it, will return again to purity of enjoyment, and the sweets of temperate liberty. The servant has become the master, and with a rod of iron, and a whip of scorpions, he will torment, even before their time, the candidates for misery in a future state.'

From sermon third we cull the following paragraph :—

'To the action of a powerful mind, a vigorous muscular frame is, as a general rule, indispensable. Like heavy ordnance, the mind in its efforts recoils on the body, and will soon shake down a puny frame. The mental action and physical reaction must be equal, or, finding her energies unsustained, the mind itself becomes discouraged, and falls into despondency and imbecility. The flow of animal spirits, the fire and vigour of the imagination, the fulness and power of feeling, the comprehension and grasp of thought, the fire of the eye, the tones of the voice, and the electrical energy of utterance, all depend upon the healthful and vigorous tone of the animal system, and by whatever means the body is unstrung, the spirit languishes. Cæsar, when he had a fever once, and cried, " Give me some drink, Titinius," was not that god who afterwards overthrown the republic, and reigned without a rival; and Bonaparte, it has been said, lost the Russian campaign by a fever. The greatest poets and orators who stand on the records of immortality, flourished in the iron age, before the habits of effeminacy had unharnessed the body and unstrung the mind. This is true of Homer, and Demosthenes, and Milton; and if Virgil and Cicero are to be classed with them, it is not without a manifest abatement of vigour for beauty, produced by the progress of voluptuousness in the age in which they lived.'

Sermon fifth closes strikingly thus :—

'The science of self-government is the science of perfect government, which we have yet to learn and teach, or this nation and the world must be governed by force. But we have all the means, and none of the impediments, which hinder the experiment amid the dynasties and feudal despotsisms of Europe. And what has been done, justifies the expectation that all which yet remains to be done will be accomplished. The abolition of the slave trade, an event now almost accomplished, was once regarded as a chimera of benevolent dreaming. But the band of Christian heroes, who consecrated their lives to the work, may some of them survive to behold it achieved. This greatest of evils upon earth, this stigma of human nature, widespread, deep-rooted, and intrenched by interest and State policy, is passing away before the unbending requisitions of an enlightened public opinion.'

No great melioration of the human condition was ever achieved without the concurrent effort of numbers; and no extended well-directed application of moral influence was ever made in vain. Let the temperate part of the nation awake, and reform, and concentrate their influence in a course of systematic action, and success is not merely probable, but absolutely certain. And cannot this be accomplished? Cannot the public attention be aroused, and set in array against the traffic in strong drinks, and against their use? With just as much certainty can the public sentiment be formed and put in motion, as the waves can be moved by the breath of heaven, or the massy rock balanced on the precipice can be pushed from its centre of motion; and when the public sentiment once begins to move, its march will be as irresistible as the same rock thundering down a precipice. Let no man, then, look upon our condition as hopeless, or feel, or think, or say that nothing can be done. The language of Heaven to our happy nation is, " Be it unto thee even as thou wilt;" and there is no despondency more fatal, or more wicked, than that which refuses to hope, and to act, from the apprehension that nothing can be done.'

From the many impressive exhortations in the last sermon of the series we give the following to young men :—

' Could I call around me in one vast assembly the temperate young men of our land, I would say, Hopes of the nation, blessed be ye of the Lord now in the dew

of your youth. But look well to your footsteps, for vipers and scorpions and adders surround your way : look at the generation who have just preceded you ; the morning of their life was cloudless, and it dawned as brightly as your own ; but behold them bitten, swollen, and enfeebled, inflamed, debauched, idle, poor, irreligious, and vicious, with halting step dragging onward to meet an early grave. Their bright prospects are clouded, and their sun is set, never to rise. No house of their own receives them, while from poorer to poorer tenements they descend, and to harder and harder fare, as improvidence dries up their resources. And now, who are those that wait on their footsteps with muffled faces and sable garments ? That is a father and that is a mother whose gray hairs are coming with sorrow to the grave ; that is a sister weeping over evils which she cannot arrest ; and there is the broken-hearted wife, and there are the children, hapless innocents, for whom their father has provided the inheritance only of dishonour and nakedness and woe. And is this, beloved young men, the history of your course ? In this scene of desolation, do you behold the image of your future selves ? Is this the poverty and disease which as an armed man shall take hold on you ? And are your fathers, and mothers, and sisters, and wives, and children, to succeed to those who now move on in this mournful procession, weeping as they go ? Yes, bright as your morning now opens, and high as your hopes beat, this is your noon and your night, unless you shun those habits of intemperance which have thus early made theirs a day of clouds and of thick darkness. If you frequent places of evening resort for social drinking, if you set out with drinking daily a little, temperately, prudently, it is yourselves which as in a glass you behold.'

Even those who may not go all Dr. Beecher's lengths in this important question cannot fail, we think, to do justice to the courage which led him 43 years ago to utter his mind so freely on the subject,—to the magnanimity of soul which disdained reproach and despised contempt,—to the honesty which marked all his statements, and the enthusiasm which inspirited all his language ; and they will not be slow to class him with such benefactors of his race as Howard and Clarkson, Garrison and Livingstone—men whose greatness lay in their grappling almost single-handed with gigantic evils, or in seeking, with little support but that of God himself, after God-like objects, in which, even if they fail, their failure is more valuable, suggestive, and hopeful than any amount of secular success.

---

#### DANIEL DEFOE.

1. *Daniel Defoe, his Life and recently-discovered Writings, Extending from 1716 to 1729.* By William Lee. London : J. C. Hotten. 1869.
2. *Daniel Defoe.* By John Forster. London : Longman. 1855.

M R. JOHN FORSTER in his clever Essay on Daniel Defoe in Messrs. Longman's 'Travellers' Library' says, 'His Life, to be fairly presented, should be written as the "Life

and Strange Surprising Adventures of Daniel Defoe, who lived above seventy years all alone in the Island of Great Britain." It might then be expected to compare in vicissitude and interest with his immortal romance. As written hitherto, it has only shared the fate of his manly but perishable polemics.' Mr. Forster scarcely exaggerates. If the hero of the romance had to spend a large portion of his life in solitude as the punishment for his love of adventure, the author of the romance had to spend a portion of his in confinement because of his love of progress. Robinson Crusoe wished to escape from the hum-drum life which surrounded him. Daniel Defoe wished to escape from the miserable meannesses of social and political corruption which abounded in his day. There is scarcely any other Englishman except Raleigh who lived so completely before his time as Defoe. Save for that fact there was scarcely anything in common between these two great sons of England. In birth, person, and career they were widely dissimilar. But the principle which guided the lives of both was the same. Raleigh was descended from one of the most ancient families in the country; Defoe was the son of a butcher. Raleigh was brought up at Court and was as handsome as Apollo; Defoe was first a hosier and then a tile maker, and had 'a hooked nose, sharp chin, grey eyes, and a large mole near his mouth.' Raleigh circumnavigated the world, and was for a considerable portion of his life sailing the seas and exploring foreign lands. Defoe migrated from London to Tilbury, and from Tilbury to Bury, and from Bury to Stoke Newington, rarely setting foot out of Britain. Raleigh wrote mellifluous verse; Defoe tersest prose. But both Raleigh and Defoe had that grand gift of foresight which has so often brought trouble to him endowed with it. Raleigh was the founder of our colonial empire and the advocate of free trade. Defoe denounced protection, imprisonment for debt, and religious disabilities, and advocated the construction of roads and the establishment of savings banks. Both were in advance of their age and suffered accordingly; Raleigh in the Tower and on the block; Defoe in Newgate and in the pillory. Honour alike to the courtly knight and to the butcher's son.

In the essay above-mentioned, Mr. Forster regrets that the only two attempts to publish a complete edition of Defoe's works had failed. An attempt of another kind has been made within the present year, but it is doubtful if Mr. Forster will be gratified by it. Mr. William Lee, whose admiration for Defoe is at least as intense as Mr. Forster's, has in the course of long and laborious investigations

alighted upon a number of Defoe's works hitherto undiscovered. Mr. Forster says that Defoe's 'last political essay was written in 1715, and while the proof sheets lay uncorrected before him, he was stricken with apoplexy.' Mr. Lee has discovered that for sixteen years after this Defoe was writing in political journals. Still more strange, he, who all his life had been the most ardent of Liberals, wrote as a Tory. But he had not changed his political creed. He had not really turned his back upon himself. He had undertaken the conduct of two or three Tory journals with the connivance of the Whig ministers in order that he might take the sting out of the politics—in order that he might serve up Toryism and water. Undoubtedly nothing can justify this conspiracy. At the same time there are excuses to be urged in mitigation. Defoe owed the Tories nothing, least of all love. They had treated him barbarously, and if he diluted their ideas and brought their principles into discredit by a purposely feeble advocacy, they had treated him far worse; they had ruined him in fortune and nearly ruined him in health. Moreover, it must be remembered, that at that time the same rule held good with regard to political which now holds good with regard to military warfare. 'All is fair in war,' was the dogma of the politicians of that day, as it is of the soldiers of this. Then, too, Defoe honestly believed Tory politics to be so bad that if he could prevent them from being advocated in their full development, he would do a service to the State. These are considerations which should influence if not the verdict, at least the sentence, which posterity passes upon Defoe. 'Guilty' we must declare him to be, but as it is 'with extenuating circumstances' we will not condemn him too severely. As for Mr. Lee, our sentiments towards him must be of a mingled character. He has discovered a most interesting incident in Defoe's life; but he has shaken one of the nation's idols upon its pedestal.

Daniel Defoe was born in the parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate, in the year 1661. A general election had just taken place, and the people had gone mad with loyal enthusiasm. It was a time of illuminations and festivities, of almost universal rejoicing. Almost, but not quite. Neither Republicanism nor Puritanism had died out entirely. It was too soon for that, and events were at hand which gave a new impulse to both, so that if they could not flourish on English soil they would transplant themselves to another. The House of Commons elected in the year of Defoe's birth was so intensely royalist and episcopalian that it was with the greatest difficulty Charles II. escaped from the perjury of rescinding the Act

of Indemnity. It was a bad time for a sturdy Nonconformist to be born in ; nevertheless Daniel Defoe was fated to date his birth from that epoch. His father was a respectable butcher, James Foe by name, and a Dissenter. He sent his son to an academy at Newington Green, kept by Mr. Charles Morton, an Oxonian, whom Harvard College, lately so prominent in English newspapers, afterwards chose for Vice-President when he was driven by the bigotry of the Court and the persecution of Parliament to find a home beyond the Atlantic. At Newington school young Foe learnt five languages and his mother tongue. Morton was in advance of his age. He saw what we, living 200 years later, are only beginning to see, that Greek Iambics and Ciceronian Latin are but a very small compensation for incapacity to write English. The world owes a debt of gratitude to Charles Morton for having thus prepared his pupil to enrich our language with some of the most vigorous writing that it contains. It had been intended that Defoe should enter the dissenting ministry, but as he grew to years of discretion he manifested a repugnance to that calling. In the first place, he saw that dissenting ministers were for the most part illiterate and were miserably paid. In the next place, he, though a Dissenter, was not convinced that the dissenting form of Church Government was the best. For these reasons he turned his thoughts in other directions. It was remarkable that he should do so. At that time literature was scarcely a recognised profession, and Defoe, who early felt drawn towards authorship, must have seen that the pulpit gave him greater opportunity for it than the shop. Nevertheless he entered into trade, and learnt business in the house of a hose factor or merchant in the city. His leisure was devoted to politics. He had the greatest horror of Popery, because he considered it synonymous with tyranny. Thus he took part in the ‘Popish plot’ agitation. He believed in the ‘plot,’ but even he could not believe all the lies told by Titus Oates. The idea of a general massacre he stigmatised as absurd. ‘A general massacre truly ! when the Papists all over the kingdom are not five to a hundred, in some counties not one, and within the city hardly one to a thousand.’ Among the units, though unavowed, was Charles II., and when he had passed to his account, a king came after him who avowed his faith honestly and openly, and endeavoured to make it the national faith. Indulgences were offered to Dissenters in order that they might be conceded also to Roman Catholics. Some of the first were for accepting the offer. Not so Defoe. ‘Was ever anything more absurd,’ he wrote,

'than the conduct of King James and his party in wheedling the Dissenters, giving them liberty of conscience by his own arbitrary dispensing authority, and his expecting that they should be content with their religion at the price of the constitution?' At all events the young hosier was not content; and so, when Monmouth raised the standard of Protestantism in rebellion against his uncle, Defoe joined it. There is no need to tell how badly the enterprise fared. It was on June 11th, 1685, that Monmouth landed at Lyme, hoisted the blue flag, and prayed for divine assistance; and by July 15th a battle had been fought and lost, and the rebel leader was a headless corpse on Tower Hill. And yet, if Defoe is to be believed, Monmouth was very nearly winning. He says that 'had not the duke's army been deceived by the darkness of the night, and led to a large ditch which they could not pass over, they had certainly surprised and overthrown the King's army, and cut them in pieces before it was known who had hurt them.' This was little consolation to Monmouth's followers, when they were brought up before Jeffreys and murdered by Kirke. Among the multitude of men and women who suffered during the Bloody Assizes were three of Defoe's fellow-students at Mr. Morton's. Defoe himself escaped. Mr. Lee says that in the same year he entered upon the hosiery business. Mr. Forster says he visited Spain, Germany, and France. It is not clear which of the two biographers is correct; but one thing appears certain,—it was about this time that '*Daniel Foe*' changed his name. Mr. Forster suggests that the prefix 'De' was a piece of innocent vanity picked up in his travels; or it may have had a more serious purpose. Mr. Lee thinks that it resulted neither from vanity nor from design, but arose simply from the fact that Daniel used to sign his name 'D. Foe,' in order to distinguish himself from his father, and that he became so well known under this title that the affix was incorporated with the patronymic.

When Defoe returned from the continent (if indeed he went there at this time), he found politics hopelessly disorganised. The King was of his own will and pleasure giving the Dissenters a liberty which the laws denied them. It is not surprising if many of them accepted the present, and saw not the guile which prompted it. There were deputations of Nonconformists going up to thank James for his arbitrary act. Penn was among the grateful ones. So was not Defoe. He saw through the stratagem, warned his co-religionists of it, and advised them to reject so thoroughly Greek a gift. He published his advice in what Mr. Lee considers to be Defoe's

first printed work. In proof of the danger incurred by all concerned in its publication, it is without date, name of printer, or place of publication. The first page is headed, ‘A Letter containing some Reflections on His Majesty’s Declaration for Liberty of Conscience. Dated the 4th April, 1687.’ It was as bold as it was clear-sighted. Though the Dissenters were by the King’s act secured liberty of conscience, and though Defoe, himself a Dissenter, was peculiarly capable of estimating the boon, he would not have it at the cost of the Constitution. He writes, ‘I will take the boldness to add one thing, that the King’s suspending of laws strikes at the root of this whole Government, and subverts it quite.’ Again, ‘When a coronation oath is so little remembered, other promises must have a proportioned degree of credit given to them.’ The risk he ran in publishing this letter was not compensated by the approbation of his friends. They condemned the letter, and disclaimed the author. The ‘grave, good, weak men’ of his party, as he called them, lectured him upon his youth and inexperience. The first result of these reproaches was that Defoe applied himself more vigorously to trade. On January 26th, 1688, he was admitted a liveryman of the city of London. What a year that was! The trial of the seven bishops, the landing of William, and the flight of James, all took place in it. Defoe was one of the warmest in his welcome of ‘the Deliverer.’ No sooner did the news arrive of the successful landing in Torbay, and the advance of the Dutch, than Defoe, armed and on horseback, left the city, and at Henley-on-Thames joined the second line of the army of the Prince of Orange. No doubt he was one of those who witnessed the entry of the King into London on December 18th. He himself tells us that he was present during the debates of the Convention, and ‘heard with inexpressible joy’ the message from the Commons delivered at the bar of the Lords by Mr. Hampden, of Buckinghamshire, ‘that it is inconsistent with the constitution of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a Popish prince.’ Defoe was one of the royal regiment of volunteer horse who accompanied William and Mary to the State banquet given to them by the Lord Mayor on October 29th, 1689. Two years later he published his first poem, a political satire directed against the Jacobite clergy. In 1692 he fell into commercial difficulties. They were the result partly of unavoidable misfortune, partly of his want of business tact. Chalmers says, ‘he spent those hours with a small society for the cultivation of public learning, which he ought to have employed in the calculation of the counting-house, and being

obliged to abscond from his creditors in 1692, he naturally attributed those misfortunes to the war, which were probably owing to his own misconduct.' Mr. Lee admits that Defoe failed through inattention to business and through over-trading. Defoe seems to be painting his own portrait in his book, '*The Compleat Tradesman*':—

'A Wit turned Tradesman! What an incongruous part of Nature is there brought together, consisting of direct contraries! No apron strings will hold him; 'tis in vain to lock him in behind the Compter, he's gone in a Moment: instead of Journal and Ledger, he runs away to his Virgil and Horace, his Journal Entries are all Pindaricks, and his Ledger all Heroicks: he is truly dramatic from one end to the other, through the whole Scene of his Trade; and as the first part is all Comedy, so the two last Acts are all made up with Tragedy; a Statute of Bankrupt is his *Exeunt Omnes*, and he generally speaks the Epilogue in the Fleet Prison or the Mint.'

If Defoe was negligent, his creditors did not suffer in the end. He compounded with them; yet he subsequently paid them not only the dividend which they had agreed to accept, but the whole of their debt. Clearly, therefore, the 'absconding' whereof we have spoken was not prompted by any intention to defraud his creditors, but was due only to his desire to escape the horrors of the debtor's prison. Once immured in gaol, there would be no hope of his retrieving his position, or of paying what he owed. He was invited by some merchants to settle in Cadiz, where they assured him of many commissions. But he declined to leave England, and took up his residence for a time in Castle-street, Bristol. One of Defoe's biographers, Mr. Walter Wilson, mentions it as an honourable tradition in his family, that at that time one of his Bristol ancestors had often seen and spoken with 'the great Defoe.' His friends called him the 'Sunday gentleman,' because, through fear of the bailiffs, he did not dare to appear in public upon any other day, while on that day he was sure to be seen with a fine flowing wig, lace ruffles, and a sword by his side, passing through the Bristol streets.

It was during this period of seclusion that he wrote his '*Enquiry into the Occasional Conformity of Dissenters in cases of Preferment*', and his '*Essay on Projects*'. In the first he contended that if Dissenters considered it wrong to go to church, the mere fact of their being appointed mayor would not render church-going right. The logic was irresistible. Once more Dissenters were shown to have sacrificed their principles to expediency. Once more Defoe was put under the ban by his co-religionists. Even the gentle Howe wrote an angry reply. It drew forth from Defoe a calm and cogent answer. The '*Essay on Projects*' was one of the most masterly of all his productions, and Benjamin Franklin after-

wards admitted the great service that it had rendered to him. It was the first of Defoe's works to attain the dignity of a volume, and it contained 350 pages. He proposed to found a royal or national bank with affiliated establishments, to improve the public highways, to establish offices for insurance against shipwreck and fire (singularly enough, he did not approve of life insurance), to start friendly societies, and societies for the relief of destitute widows and seamen ; he suggested the opening of a pension office in every county for the reception of deposits from the poor (an anticipation of savings' banks, combined with the still more recent provision for conversion into annuities) ; he urged the erection of an institution for the care and maintenance of idiots, whom he called 'a particular rent-charge on the great family of mankind ;' he advised the appointment of a commission of inquiry into bankruptcy for the relief of unfortunate but honest traders ; he recommended an extensive reform of school-teaching, with especial reference to the teaching of the English language ; he proposed the founding of an academy for military studies (which he considered the most noble of all his inventions), the founding also of an academy for military exercises, and of an academy for women. His last 'project' was one for the registration of all the seamen of the United Kingdom. The pending war with France respecting the Spanish succession was the next subject on which Defoe wrote. But soon there came a topic which stirred him to the innermost depths of his heart. A Mr. Tutchin published on August 1st, 1700, a pamphlet called 'The Foreigners.' It was in bad verse, and was a fierce attack upon the Dutch in general, and King William in particular. This 'vile abhorred pamphlet,' says Defoe, 'filled me with a kind of rage against the book, and gave birth to a trifle which I never could hope would have met with so general an acceptance as it did.' This 'trifle' was 'The True-born Englishman,—a Satyr.' It had a marvellous success. Published without the name of either author or bookseller, it nevertheless took possession of all readers, from the King on his throne to the humble buyers of penny piracies hawked in the streets. 'It is very probable,' says Mr. Lee, 'that from the invention of printing to the end of 1701, an equal number of copies had never been sold of any book within the space of one year.' In the preface to the second volume of his collected writings Defoe complained of the pecuniary loss he had sustained by these piracies. At that time there had been nine authorised editions and twelve unauthorised. The first were published at a shilling, the second at prices varying from sixpence to a

penny, and of these last there had been eighty others sold in the streets. In this way Defoe considered that he had been robbed of at least £1,000. However, he was paid in another way. The 'Satyr' brought him under the notice of William and Mary. He advised the Queen how to lay out the gardens at Hampton Court. He devised with the King means for carrying on the war with France. That war was inevitable now. It was no mere feud of rival races. Louis had offered both a menace and an insult to the British nation. James II. had died, and Louis recognised James's son as King of England, in defiance of his promise not to afford assistance to any person against King William. The English people were nothing loth for war. Defoe indeed thought them too ready, inasmuch as he did not consider the bare recognition of the Pretender was a violation of the Treaty of Ryswick. A general election took place in 1701. Defoe gave the King most valuable help. Several able pamphlets came from his pen at this time. The Duke of Gloucester had died during the recess, and William had arranged with the Electress Sophia for the future accession of the House of Hanover, and on the opening of the new Parliament urged the two Houses to pass the act which would be introduced. Defoe urged it elsewhere, and the measure became law. Nevertheless, the new House of Commons was very bitter against the King. As Mr. Forster has remarked, 'It will not be too much to say, that at this moment the most unpopular man in England was the man who had saved England.' Articles of impeachment were prepared against the ministers who were the King's chief friends. At length, by their quarrels and resulting procrastination, the Commons themselves became so unpopular that a crisis ensued. A large number of the leading men of Kent presented a petition by five of their number, calling upon the House of Commons to give the King such supplies as would enable him to provide for the interests of the kingdom and assist his allies before it was too late. An angry debate followed, and the petitioners were ordered into custody, and remained there from the beginning of May to Midsummer Day, 1701, when Parliament was prorogued. Nothing daunted by their fate, Defoe on the very day after their committal went down to the House, guarded by sixteen gentlemen of quality, who were prepared to carry him off by force if it should be necessary to do so, and presented to the Speaker his celebrated 'Legion's Memorial.' Harley (afterwards Defoe's friend) was the Speaker, and, as he passed into the House of Commons, a man 'muffled in a cloak,' says Mr. Forster, though Mr. Lee implies that Defoe acted boldly and without disguise, placed the memorial in his

hands. It is said that Harley recognised Defoe, but kept his own counsel. The memorial was written in the tersest English, and it assumed, perhaps for the first time in history, that the Commons were the servants of the people, and bound to obey them. It concluded as follows :—

‘Thus, gentlemen, you have your duty laid before you, which ‘tis hoped you will think of; but if you continue to neglect it, you may be expected to be treated according to the resentment of an injured Nation; for Englishmen are no more to be slaves to Parliaments than to a King.

‘Our Name is Legion, and we are Many.’

The memorial was accompanied by a letter commanding the Speaker to read the first-mentioned document to the House. It produced a remarkable effect. Nothing more was said about prosecuting the five; the supplies were voted, and the prisoners, as soon as they were released, were feasted at Mercers’ Hall, where next to them sat the author of the ‘Legion Letter.’

In the summer of this year, William visited the continent to arrange an alliance with Holland and Germany against France. He was taken seriously ill at the Hague. He there learnt that he had disease of the lungs, and could not hope to recover. Shortly after his return to Hampton Court, he felt himself so much worse that he told the Earl of Portland that he did not expect to see another summer, but charged him to tell nobody. Until the close of his life he occupied himself with public affairs. Defoe drew up a scheme of operations against the Spanish West Indies. He also endeavoured to persuade the King to effect a union of government between England and Scotland. William admitted the importance of the measure, said that it would soon come, but added, ‘not yet, there is other more pressing work to be done.’ The King died March 8th, 1702, and was mourned by no one more than, perhaps by no one so much as, Daniel Defoe.

Defoe had good reason to mourn. The crown passed to Anne, and the Jacobites rejoiced that the royal family were come again to the throne of their ancestors. William’s Whig ministers were dismissed,—the Tories were called in. Defoe suffered political eclipse with his friends. He was indignant at the unjust reflections which were made upon his late sovereign, and published a rhymed satire, ‘The Mock Mourners,’ which passed through six editions in nine months. Religious intolerance was now more rampant than ever. It was shared unfortunately by the people, excited by Sacheverell, who had declared in the pulpit at Oxford that he could not be a true son of the Church who did not against the Dissenters hang out ‘the bloody flag and banner of defiance.’

This sermon was sold in the London streets for twopence, and straightway the readers thereof proceeded to insult prominent Dissenters in the streets, and to pull down dissenting chapels. At that time, and for some time subsequently, the people and the House of Commons were madly intolerant, and it was the House of Lords which opposed them and used the utmost efforts to prevent the passage of penal laws. Defoe was aroused by the savage declamation of Sacheverell and of men like-minded. He wrote a pamphlet called ‘The Shortest Way with the Dissenters,’ in which he proved, logically enough if the premisses were granted, that ‘the shortest way’ was to ‘cut the throat of the whole party.’ The pamphlet was hailed with rapture by the more extravagant zealots. Everywhere the argument, urged in irony, was considered to be the genuine wish of the writer. A Cambridge Fellow wrote to thank his bookseller for having sent ‘so excellent a treatise, it being, next to the Holy Bible and the sacred comments, the most valuable he had ever seen.’ Apparently it was not until the name of the author became known that the satire was found out and the sarcasm was recognised. The rage of those who had been duped knew no bounds. The Government offered a reward of £50 for Defoe’s apprehension. At first he concealed himself, but when the printer and the bookseller were taken into custody, Defoe voluntarily surrendered himself in order that ‘others should not,’ as he said, ‘be ruined by his mistake.’ The pamphlet was ordered to be burnt by the common hangman, and its author was condemned to the pillory and to indefinite imprisonment in Newgate. It was on the 29th, 30th, and 31st July, 1703, that he appeared in the place of shame. The people gathered around, but did not, as was their wont on such occasions, pelt the prisoner with mud and harder missiles. On the contrary, they decked the pillory with garlands, drank his health while he stood, and hurrahed when he was taken down. Defoe had composed ‘A Hymn to the Pillory,’ and it was sung in his honour by those who witnessed that which was intended to be his disgrace. ‘Tell them,’ he wrote and they sang—

‘Tell them the men that placed him here  
Are scandals to the times,  
Are at a loss to find his guilt,  
And can’t commit his crimes.’

Mr. Eyre Crowe has commemorated this memorable scene in one of his most vigorous pictures.

Between the time of Defoe’s committal to Newgate and his exposure on the pillory he wrote a pamphlet which shewed

how little malice he bore to the Church which was persecuting him. It was entitled ‘The Shortest Way to Peace and Union, by the Author of “The Shortest Way with the Dissenters.”’ Its object was to convince Dissenters that there ought to be an established religion in connection with the State, and that the Church of England is not only the most fit, but the most capable institution for maintaining the Protestant supremacy. It exhorted Dissenters to avoid all conflict with the Church, and to rest content with the privileges they enjoyed; and it advised High Churchmen to cease from all attempts to deprive their dissenting brethren of toleration. He was to have plenty of leisure for writing now. He returned from the pillory to Newgate. He was obliged to give up his tilery at Tilbury, which had been a source of wealth to him, and thereby he lost £3,500, a large sum at that time, and Defoe was rendered by his imprisonment quite incapable of recovering it. Life in Newgate was not, however, to be a blank either to him or to his readers. He sent out pamphlet after pamphlet—sixteen in all—some of them in support of the Lords who, *mirabile dictu*, were endeavouring to restrain the bigotry of the Commons, and who refused to pass the bill to prevent occasional conformity on the part of Dissenters, even though it was tacked on to a money bill. But the great achievement of his imprisonment was the starting and the editing of the *Review*. The first number appeared February 19th, 1704. At the commencement it was a weekly paper, but it was soon brought out twice and then thrice a week, and for a short period there were no fewer than five issues. The publication continued for over nine years, the last number appearing on June 11th, 1713. Its primary object was to treat of news, politics, and trade, both domestic and foreign; but in order to secure a wider circulation, Defoe gave also what he termed a ‘Scandal Club,’ whose purpose was to exalt virtue, to correct vice and folly, to discuss casuistical questions from real or fictitious correspondents in divinity, morals, language, science, poetry, love, &c.

‘When it is remembered (says Mr. Lee) that no other pen than that of Defoe was ever employed upon a work appearing at such frequent intervals, extending over more than a year, and embracing, in more than 5,000 printed pages, essays on almost every branch of human knowledge, the achievement must be pronounced a great one, even had he written nothing else. If we add that, between the date of the first and last numbers of the *Review*, he wrote and published no less than 80 other distinct works, containing 4,727 pages, and perhaps more, not now known, the fertility of his genius must appear as astounding as the greatness of his capacity for labour.’

So far as pecuniary profit from the *Review* was concerned, there was little for the author. He had no protection against

continued piracy, and while his publisher could account for only hundreds the paper was selling by thousands. In one of the latest numbers Defoe wrote, ‘I have espoused an honest interest, and have steadily adhered to it all my days. I never forsook it when it was oppressed ; never made a gain by it when it was advanced, and I thank God it is not in the power of all the courts and parties in Christendom to bid a price high enough to buy me off from it, or make me desert it.’ If it seems difficult to have written a newspaper in prison, that was a comparatively easy task compared with writing it when travelling about the country on affairs of State. Defoe had experience of both difficulties. Nottingham and Rochester had resigned ; Harley, who had kept his counsel respecting Defoe on a memorable occasion, had taken office. One of Harley’s first thoughts was for Defoe. He sent two Lords to Newgate with the message, ‘Pray ask that gentleman what I can do for him ?’ Defoe took out pen and ink, and wrote the story of the blind man in the Gospel, to whom our Lord said, ‘What wilt thou that I should do unto thee ?’ ‘Who (adds Defoe) as if he had made it strange that such a question could be asked, or as if he had said, Lord, dost thou see that I am blind, and yet ask me what thou shalt do for me ? My answer is plain in my misery, Lord, that I may receive my sight !’ Harley understood the answer, and he did more than comply with Defoe’s request. He represented the prisoner’s hard case to the Queen. She was indignant, and after four months of delay not only was Defoe released, but a royal gift was sent him for the benefit of his wife and children, and for the payment of the fine that had been imposed upon him. He left Newgate after a year and a half’s imprisonment therein. He came out with impaired health and shattered fortune, and he retired for a time to Bury St. Edmunds. Even there he worked hard, and helped to support the Lords in their opposition to the arbitrary and unconstitutional proceedings of the Commons. He also opposed a bill which had been introduced by a member of the Lower House, Sir Humphrey Mackworth, to establish in every parish a parochial manufactory for giving employment to the poor. Defoe shewed how thoroughly opposed the project was to sound political economy, and used cogent arguments which might have been studied with advantage a century and a half later by the French republicans who in 1848 advocated the founding of national workshops. His pamphlet proved that giving alms was no charity, and that the employment of the poor by the State would be a grievance to the nation. The Commons passed the bill, but the Lords rejected it. A little later the conflict between the two Houses

became so fierce that Parliament was dissolved. Defoe took advantage of the general election which followed to urge moderation and harmony on all parties; the High Church Tories, the Pretender's or Hereditary-right Party, the late Ministry, the Church of England, and the Dissenters. To the last of these he reiterated the advice which he had given on a former occasion, that they should support the Established Church as being the best barrier against Popery. He seems to have been in great pecuniary difficulties at the time, and to have been compelled to leave London *incognito*. He was assisted in his distress by Harley, who employed him as an electioneering agent to visit the numberless small boroughs in Devonshire and Cornwall on behalf of the ministry. All that time he continued the *Review*, and some of the numbers were written during his long journeys on horseback. A little later he was employed by Godolphin, who had formed a high opinion of his abilities, to promote the legislative union between England and Scotland. For this purpose he travelled in Scotland, and made many influential friends. Mr. Forster thinks that previously to this he was employed by Lord Halifax on the continent in a secret service of some danger. Mr. Lee doubts this, and contends that when Defoe, in the letters written at this time, speaks of being 'abroad,' he meant only that he was at large—at liberty. Whether this supposition be true or not, Defoe speaks of the employment as having involved him in considerable peril. He wrote afterwards: 'I ran as much danger of my life as a grenadier upon the counterscarp.' The mission, wherever and whatever it was, had a successful termination, and Defoe was rewarded with a Government sinecure. It was sorely needed, for his political antagonists were merciless. They pursued him with writs and warrants, false warrants some of them, sham actions many of them. At last he surrendered himself to the Commissioners of Bankruptcy appointed under a recent act of Parliament. He obtained his discharge, and thus he was one of the first to reap the benefit of the reform which he had urged and done so much to promote.

Early in 1708, Defoe, who had been absent from his family for sixteen months, returned to England from Scotland. At that time court intrigues had led to the dismissal of Harley. Defoe was prepared to share the ill-fortunes of his patron, but the minister handsomely released him from all obligations, and warmly recommended him to Godolphin. The latter statesman knew sufficient of Defoe to understand his worth, gave him the opportunity of kissing the Queen's hand, and at once despatched him to Scotland in order to support the royal

cause against the intrigues of the Pretender. Defoe about this time published a History of the Union, in which he highly eulogised the Scotch. He also saw passed a measure which he had most earnestly promoted, and for the want of which he had most severely suffered—the Copyright Act. Then came the famous Sacheverell trial. The ‘Bloody Flag’ doctor had preached in St. Paul’s Cathedral a sermon entitled ‘Perils among False Brethren,’ which he afterwards published and dedicated to the Lord Mayor and the Aldermen. It was worthy of the Oxford sermon. It was so full of incendiarism that ministers determined to prosecute the preacher. This was a fatal error. Defoe saw it, and urged, ‘Let us have the crime punished, not the man; the bar of the House of Commons is the worst pillory in the nation.’ Harley saw it, and rejoiced, declaring ‘The game is up.’ Sacheverell became the popular martyr. The women worshipped him, the mob cheered him, and diversified their acclamations with demolishing dissenting chapels. Godolphin had to resign, and Harley took his place. He tried at first to effect a coalition with Walpole and the Whigs. As they would not be colleagues he determined to treat them as foes, and to put them down. He took St. John into office: he employed Swift the Tory, and Congreve the Whig. How about Defoe? He waited first upon Godolphin, who gave him full leave to serve Harley, as Harley had given him leave to serve Godolphin. He waited next upon Harley, and this is his own account of the interview:—

‘By this I was providentially cast back upon my Original Benefactor, who according to his wonted goodness was pleased to lay my case before her Majesty, and thereby I preserved my interest in her Majesty’s favour, but without any engagement of service. As for consideration, pension, gratification, or reward, I declare to all the world I have had none; except only that old appointment which her Majesty was pleased to make me in the days of the ministry of Lord Godolphin, of which I have spoken already, and which was for services done in a foreign country some years before. Neither have I been employed, or directed or ordered by my Lord Treasurer aforesaid to do, or not to do, anything in the affairs of the unhappy differences which have so long perplexed us, and for which I have suffered so many, and such unjust reproaches.’

Defoe felt convinced that Harley was secretly a Whig, and that he, as well as any other minister, would be compelled to govern upon Whig principles. He said:—

‘The Revolution cannot be overthrown in Britain. It is not in the power of ministry or party, Prince or Parliament, to do it. If the attempt is made, let them look to it that venture upon the attempt. The people of England have tasted liberty, and I cannot think they will bear the exchange.’ He declares that he will not go along with the ministry unless they go along with him; and adds: ‘The constitution is of such a nature that whoever may be in it, if they are faithful to

their duty, it will either find them Whigs, or make them so.' In short, he says, 'we have but one interest as Englishmen, whatever interest we may have as to parties.'

Harley dissolved Parliament, and Defoe made an electioneering tour as before. He was scandalised by the scenes of riot and drunkenness that he witnessed, and the *Review* during nearly the whole of October, 1710, was filled with descriptions of, and protests against, the prevalent debauchery. On February 1st, 1711, the corporation of Edinburgh empowered him to publish the *Edinburgh Courant*, but it is probable that he did not continue the publication for many weeks, as he returned to England in the following month. His return was probably caused by the attempt to assassinate Harley. That crime induced Defoe to write his pamphlet, 'Eleven Opinions about Mr. H——y, with Observations.' The merits and the faults of the minister were set forth with professed impartiality, but on the whole the pamphlet was favourable to its subject, and must have been serviceable to him. At this time the national resources had become terribly exhausted by the long war with France. Though it had been a war fruitful of great victories, the nation was growing heartily weary of it, and Defoe published more than one pamphlet in favour of ending it. Negotiations for peace were shortly afterwards set on foot, and terminated April 11th, 1713, in the Treaty of Utrecht. Defoe was less successful in another cause. Once more the intolerant Act against Occasional Conformity was brought in, and as it was no longer opposed by the Lords, Harley (now become Earl of Oxford) himself supporting it, it was carried rapidly through both Houses in spite of Defoe's manly protest. The bigots having won this victory after so many defeats, were encouraged to attempt another. They attacked the liberty of the press. They put a tax upon newspapers, with the scarcely concealed object of extinguishing a large number of them. Defoe protested vehemently and courageously, but in vain. For a time he carried on the *Review*, but on June 11th, 1713, appeared the last number, and its last line was, 'Exit *Review*.' There is but one perfect set of the whole issue, and that is in the possession of Mr. Crossley, of Manchester.

About this time Defoe got into serious trouble. Queen Anne had lost, one by one, all her children. She was now a widow, and there was no chance of an heir to the throne in direct succession. At the same time the Pretender was constantly plotting for the restoration of the Stuarts. What more natural for a man who ardently wished to continue the Protestant succession, than that he should call public attention to the matter? Defoe did so in several pamphlets, one

of them entitled, ‘Hannibal at the Gates,’ another, ‘Reasons against the Succession of the House of Hanover,’ and a third, ‘What if the Queen should die?’ The second of these was a satire upon the Jacobites, and its title was chosen in order to induce them to read the work. Nevertheless his enemies, the Whigs—for they had now become bitterly hostile to him, presumably on account of the support which he had given to Harley—accused him of Jacobitism, and instituted legal proceedings against him. He was prosecuted by the Attorney-General, and, in spite of his defence that he had written things that would cause him to lose his head if the Pretender came to the crown, and that if the Elector of Hanover had paid him £1,000, he (Defoe) could not have served him better, he was found guilty, and sentenced to imprisonment, the convicting judges intimating that he was lucky to have escaped hanging, drawing, and quartering. It was fortunate for him that his old benefactor was in office. Oxford laid the case before the Queen, who at once saw the malignity of the prosecutors, and ordered Defoe to be pardoned. For that act of justice she and her minister were accused of favouring the Pretender.

The deluge was at hand. Probably at no period of English history did party spirit run so high as during the closing month of Anne’s reign. Bolingbroke, whom Oxford had called to his aid, repaid the kindness by displacing him, and so mad was the nation against the fallen statesman that it was proposed to impeach him. Though riddance had been made of one minister, there was no peace among the others. They quarrelled so violently in the presence of the Queen as she lay on a bed of sickness, that they hastened her death. Then the House of Hanover appeared on the scene, and Bolingbroke was disgraced. Oxford was in the Tower, yet Defoe did not shrink from defending his old patron, even in that perilous time, and even though he had by no means approved of Oxford’s policy.

The Whigs were now triumphant, and they spared nobody. Defoe, who had laboured more than all of them for the Protestant succession, found himself in serious peril by the realisation of his most ardent wish. He published ‘An Appeal to Honour and Justice, though it be of his Worst Enemies. By Daniel Defoe.’ ‘One of the most manly, yet deeply pathetic, utterances of a human heart,’ says Mr. Lee. Worn out by anxiety and over-work, stung by the ingratitude of those in whose behalf he had toiled, he was struck down by apoplexy. He recovered, but according to the general belief, he retired from

political life, and devoted the remaining sixteen years of his existence to purely literary employment.

It is at this point that we come to Mr. Lee's remarkable discovery. Defoe had been brought to trial for a pamphlet in which he made certain allegations against the Earl of Anglesey, and, being found guilty, his sentence was deferred until the following term. During the interval Defoe sent a letter to Lord Chief Justice Parker, setting forth his own history. The letter had such an effect upon the Judge that he prevented any further proceedings against Defoe, and brought about a reconciliation between him and the Whigs. This was followed by an engagement between them, which Defoe fulfilled so much to their satisfaction that he received a handsome acknowledgment. About this time, Dormer, the proprietor of the *News Letter*, a Tory and High Church paper, being unable to carry it on, offered Defoe the management of it and a share in it. Defoe consulted the minister, Lord Townshend, who thought that if Defoe responded to the offer it would be a very acceptable piece of service, for the *Letter* 'was really very prejudicial to the public, and most difficult to come at in a judicial way, in case of offence given.' So Defoe entered into partnership with Dormer, and in the hands of the first 'the sting was taken out and the mischief prevented.' But 'it still seemed to be Tory in order to amuse the party and prevent their setting up another violent paper, which would have destroyed the design.' This intrigue led to others of a similar character. A Mr. Mist published *Mist's Journal*, as the organ of the Pretender. With Lord Sunderland's approbation, Defoe offered himself as a translator of foreign news; but, says Mr. Lee, with the object of 'keeping the journal in the circle of a secret management, so that it might pass as a Tory paper and yet be disabled and enervated of its treasonable character, "so as to do no mischief or give any offence to the Government." In this way Defoe became acquainted with much treasonable matter useful for the ministers to know. Mr. Lee thinks that the arrangement was justifiable on the ground that moral suasion is better than legal repression, that prevention is better than cure; and he commends Defoe's courage in placing himself in a position of such delicacy and danger. As for Defoe, he silenced any scruples he might have had by Scriptural precedent. 'Thus I bow myself in the House of Rimmon,' was his excuse. He certainly did not like the work, and while he was writing diluted Toryism in one publication in order to please the minister, he started an honest Whig journal in order to please himself. It must not be imagined that, even in the first, Defoe wrote merely on

politics. He wrote also, and far more satisfactorily on social topics. When he and Mist quarrelled and separated, the latter soon learnt the value of Defoe's writing by the diminished circulation of the journal. The result was a renewal of their relations. Some years later there was another rupture.

Of the remainder of Defoe's career we must speak briefly. It was on April 25th, 1719, that his most famous work was published. He was fifty-eight years old, a time of life at which the imagination has usually lost its energy. Nevertheless it was at that period that 'Robinson Crusoe' was produced. It was founded upon a meagre account, published by Captain Rogers, of the adventures of Alexander Selkirk whom he had rescued from a desert island. Defoe parted with the volume for a comparatively small sum. It sold so rapidly that the publisher made a fortune out of it. Four editions were issued in four months. That eminent antiquarian, Sir Henry Ellis, has attempted to rob Defoe both of his fame and of his honesty by declaring that 'Robinson Crusoe' was written by the Earl of Oxford (Harley) while in the Tower, and that he gave it to Defoe who published it as his own. The truth is, that Harley was prostrated by illness throughout his incarceration, and it was thought doubtful if he would live to be tried. He was, therefore, quite incapable of writing. Some of Defoe's later works were of questionable advantage to the public morals. They were lives of notorious criminals. As he was now in easy circumstances, he could scarcely have been induced by the love of money to write them. Mr. Lee supposes that Defoe, being well aware of the mischievous literature which circulated among the lower classes, wished to substitute for it tales which, while they would attract, had also a moral and taught that in the long run virtue is better than vice. In the later years of his life he was affluent, and built himself a large house in Stoke Newington. Nevertheless, his last days were embittered by the misconduct of his son and by a painful disease. He died April 26th, 1731, and was buried in the Dissenting Walhalla, now known as Bunhill Fields.

---

#### AN AUNT'S TALE.

IT is many years ago now, since my niece Cecilia came first to live with me. She was a bright-eyed, intelligent little girl, and my solitary house was enlivened with her childish ways and smiling speeches. She and I soon became great

friends, playmates I may say ; for, old as I was, I was not too old or too stiff to join her in a game of ball, or a competition with the skipping rope. Yes, I am small and light, and that is the reason, perhaps, why I never lost the accomplishment of skipping, not at least till Cecilia was grown up, and had laid skipping ropes away as too childish even for her. Then I, too, laid up my old implement on a shelf, and with a sigh of regret, remembering our many pleasant hours together, said good-bye to it. Cecilia was an orphan, and had known little of her parents, and that was one reason, no doubt, why she clung more fondly to her old aunt, and came to consider her in time as, in some sort, her mother. Once she called me 'Mother,' I remember, in a moment of unusual affection, but I, recollecting how sacred the name was, and how dearly the one had prized it, who had best right to be called so, and how much she had suffered to win the name, checked her, and declared that I desired to be called nothing but Aunt, while I lived. 'Aunt, dear aunt !' she exclaimed, 'I shall never love any one better than you !' 'Some day you will, I hope, my dear,' was my reply. She was skipping at the time, and ceased her skipping to look at me a moment in surprise, and to think. And then she understood me, and a girlish flush came into her cheeks as she said, quite innocently, 'Well, I shouldn't like to be an old maid.' 'And why not ?' I asked. 'Because—because—I think *you* don't like it !' How had she got to know that, I wonder ? I had never said so. I had always felt myself a peculiarly favoured individual, with rights and freedoms that one-half the married women never get. One-half ? Two-thirds, I may say, with perfect truth. I had never complained in her hearing of my isolated position, never hinted at any forlornness it might have, but it was evident that Cecilia, young as she was, had guessed more than I had intended she should know. 'You're a little goose,' was my answer, but she knew that she had spoken the truth, and a roguish light came into her eyes, as she answered with glee, 'I know I'm right though, aunty ! you wouldn't be an old maid if you could help it, would you ?' 'Old maids are often the happiest,' I said with proper gravity, shirking her question, 'and I beg you won't despise them, Cissy.' 'No ; but for all that, aunt, I hope *I* shan't be an old maid !' Poor Cissy ! Her words were innocent enough, and girlish enough, but I think she lived to find that there is a worse condition in the world than that of an old maid.

Was it the desire not to be an old maid that led her at nineteen to be so fond of her cousin Thomas Grey ? I thought it a delusion at the time, and was seriously distressed at it, for

Thomas, though likely to have wealth and good position, was of a roving, unsettled temperament. Good tempered, and good looking, he was, that I could not deny, and fascinating enough to a young girl; and he chose very perversely to fall in love with my bright-eyed Cecilia, who had her attractions also, and though not exactly a beauty, was, in my opinion, really lovely to look upon at times. She was the very light of my eyes and the sunshine of my home at that period, and it was grievous beyond measure to think of parting with her to any one. Does a man ever have a due sense of the robbery he commits when he singles out the chosen lamb of the flock, or the only one, for his own special comfort and delight, and carries her away in a lordly fashion to have and to hold for evermore? Does he ever think of the broken heart strings of those who are left behind, that he may have a companion to cheer and love and solace him? He has had none of the care and expense of the rearing, none of the thousand solicitudes that beset parents and guardians, yet when he carries away his bride from the altar, he is too apt to consider his own possessions as paramount, and to forget or ignore the love claims of the old friends at the old hearth. I should have viewed with much selfish discontent the advent of any one intending to take from me my own treasure, for at least ten years to come. At nine-and-twenty, I thought I could bring my heart *for her sake* to spare her, but at nineteen it seemed impossible. Even to the most unexceptionable lover I should at first have turned the cold shoulder, but to Thomas Grey I was deaf and inexorable.

Cissy turned pale when I forbade him the house, but her love for me was great, and she acquiesced in my decision. She told him it could never, never be; she wrote him a letter of farewell, which she showed me, and then she put up her mouth for me to kiss, with a forced smile on her trembling lips, and sealed the letter resolutely and sent it. I loved her so much at the moment, that I all but relented, and ached with a longing to say, 'marry him, dear, if you will!' But I did not. A stern truth was ever present to my mind that with him was neither stability nor happiness, and I said to myself that Cecilia would see this herself soon, when he should go away and forget her. I believe that her wound, though painful, was not incapable of healing, and that time and separation would bring a cure. She was a brave, good girl, and neither pined away, nor suggested by her looks that I had been an unfeeling ogre. There was a little more gravity in her face, and a little less buoyancy in her step, and she was a little fonder of plaintive music;—that was all. Thomas

Grey went away to foreign lands. He said before he went that he should never forget her, that she was the only woman he should ever love. It was the usual rhodomontade of a disappointed lover, I thought, and his words gave me no apprehension. ‘Has he ever been steady to any one thing in his life?’ I asked myself.

To disappoint me, however, he was steady in this. In two years he returned to England, browner, taller, more manly, more subdued in the expression of his love, but more determined than ever to win my pearl. I did not invite him to my house. I would not see him. I guarded my treasure jealously, but he could still write, and he wrote both to her and to me. He avowed anew to me his resolve to dedicate his life’s love to Cecilia—she was his star—his happiness—life would be nothing to him without her. I put his letter in the fire, though I could not but wonder at his perseverance. ‘And yet, he must never have her,’ I said to myself, ‘his father was not such a father as I should desire for Cecilia, and Thomas resembles him in some degree, and has the spirit of unrest within him. How can I consent to such a union?’ Again my *No* was given, even more strongly than before, and again Cecilia submitted, and again he went abroad, a desperate man, as he declared. But he returned a second time, and yet a third, and still a faithful lover. And my niece silently loved him all the time, and coldly put aside other offers of marriage, and to my sorrow I was forced to see that her best years were passing in all the wearying dissatisfaction of a forbidden attachment. Seven years I had opposed, but the young people were too strong for me, and my opposition at last sank down before them, like a wall undermined by a flood. Not without many misgivings at first, for his family had been cursed with an unhappiness that is only too common, and I trembled for my darling when I thought of the danger there might be for him and for her. Old maid as I was, I had had my experiences of family life, and I could look abroad among the families of my acquaintances, and see beneath the surface, often so smiling and agreeable, and could point out the exact spot where lay the treacherous pool beneath the thin plausible ice of conventional propriety. I talked to Cecilia of my fears. I set before her the danger of uniting herself with a man whose father had shortened his life by excesses, and had educated his son in the same habits; but she smiled away my apprehensions, and said that she was sure nothing would persuade Thomas to follow his father’s example; that he knew where to draw the line between temperance and over-indulgence; that he was wise; he knew the danger; he was good, and would

never so grieve her. They had talked all this matter over together, and my fears were without necessity. And in this way I was talked down to believe and hope the best ; and I acknowledge, too, that when Thomas Grey once more came into my house as an invited visitor—I will not call him a welcome one—I began in some measure to reproach myself for my over-care and squeamishness. There seemed so much good sense and so much thoughtful care and love for Cecilia, that I felt somewhat ashamed of my long shyness and disapproval. Travel had improved him, I thought, and I rejoiced in the thought. It was such a genuine joy, too, to see Cecilia made happy. They were married, and the position he chose to occupy was that of a gentleman farmer. He had a small estate not very far from my abode, and upon it he built a pleasant and convenient house, which was to be their home for many years to come. Four miles was the distance between this house and mine ; in summer an agreeable walk, and every inch of the distance was soon perfectly known to me, as well known as the beds and paths of my garden. Every tree and bush on the way became familiar to me, and the bloom by the roadside, and the heather on the windy common, from which I could first get a view of Dale House and farm, were quite dear friends from often companionship. The last part of the way was the pleasantest, for here Cecilia would often meet me, the winding lane by which I came being overlooked from her parlour windows ; and her smiling face and eager step would be at my side long before the garden gate of her house showed its white palings among the laurels. Thomas, too, would sometimes come, in his first bridegroom days, and affect to scold her for being in such haste to leave him when my black bonnet dodged the distant hedgerow trees. That, of course, was a happy time, happy to them and to me, for though my own house was darker and greyer than before, and suffered by the loss of my dear companion, and by the contrast with Dale House, whose modern furniture and fresh upholstery and new high rooms made my old chairs and curtains and small house seem, like myself, wondrously old-fashioned, I could not but rejoice at Cecilia's happiness too much to be anything but satisfied and glad. What did it matter if to me came solitary hours and deepening shadows, if, to her, hours of fuller contentment were meted out ? What, if my heart now and then ached after the old companionship, if the desire of her heart was fulfilled ?

In the second year of their marriage came a change. Very small at first, so small that, but that my thoughts were so perpetually brooding over everything that concerned my

adopted child, I should not have noticed the slight shade of graver thought upon her face, the sigh now and then, the less ready laugh, signs of an inner change that I was quick to read and to comment upon to myself. But I asked no questions, and was resolute to see in them only the traces of the gentle melancholy, if that be not too grave a word, that time and household cares bring with them to most women, married or unmarried. The first flush and joy of youth were over; life was become more earnest and less hopeful; there was less joy, but there was, I trusted, no less peace. The years went on, and there was no promise of motherhood at Dale House; a disappointment to both Thomas and his wife; and when Cecilia's brow became graver, and her mouth settled into sedater curves, I attributed the change to this disappointment. Thomas, too, changed slowly, and I did not think the change for the better. He lost refinement, and was often querulous and impatient. He became restless and wearied of quiet evenings; and, to please him, Cecilia was seldom without visitors of the kind he liked best, people who were gay and noisy, full of life and excitement, and with little thought. Talkative, fashionable guests were first invited; and when these wearied of coming, and could not be had, visitors of a lower grade were sought out; for an evening without company was to Thomas Grey as objectionable as a house in winter without a fire. My visits became less frequent as Dale House became lively with guests incessantly going and coming, and it was seldom at this time that Cecilia could find opportunity either to give me an hour's quiet attention in her own home, or to accept one in mine, and for a whole season the broom on the way to Dale House turned from green to golden, and the heather on the common to glowing purple and then to rusty brown, all unseen by me. Not that my niece was invisible also. I had frequent glimpses of her, on horseback or in the carriage, among a flutter of fine people and fine dresses, smiling sometimes, laughing now and then, or giving me a tired glance from eyes that were getting dimmer and hollower than they should be for the years they had seen; but always too busy to stay with me more than for a few minutes. I got through long tasks in netting and knitting that summer, produced a wonder of a counterpane, and manufactured a set of curtains that certainly were pretty enough, but many a sigh, after past days, was worked in with the stitches, and the counterpane, if it could have expressed my prevailing thought, would have been full of knitted Cecilias. 'How is the farm getting on?' was my frequent mental question; but I remembered that Thomas had a competent bailiff, and needed not to be always

looking after the land. ‘He must have excitement,’ I said, ‘it is better to have the excitement of gay company than that which brought his father to a premature grave.’ And with this poor comfort I tried to be content. And yet—how much better it might have been! For, it was becoming quite plain and clear to me, that the marriage was not a successful one. There was neither true peace nor content in it. Cecilia was getting old and worn before her time. Thomas was getting weary; was it of her, or of himself? Of both, I feared. I called this my twilight thought, which came to me when I was seated alone near my parlour window, watching the grey world get greyer beneath the darkening sky. As the light decayed, my hope decayed with it, and Cecilia’s future seemed dark indeed. But when the night was passed, and the bright beams of morning smote joyfully my opening eyes, a corresponding brightness came over my anticipations, and Dale House and its inmates had no sad experiences to expect, and my twilight thought was a fancy merely.

The seventh anniversary of their wedding-day came round, and I had been invited for weeks beforehand to the customary entertainments. I had had a slight touch of rheumatism, and had striven to be excused from making one at the wedding dinner, but Cecilia was so much in earnest that I should go, that there was nothing to do but to yield to her wish. To please me, it was to be a very quiet affair; not above a dozen to dinner, and a very, very little dancing afterwards just for the young people of the neighbourhood, who were only to have tea. ‘Well, my dear,’ said I, ‘if it is necessary that such an old woman as I should be present to look on—’

‘Of course it is necessary, quite necessary. We couldn’t do without you; we never did yet,’ was the reply. ‘And I do want you so much; more than I can tell you. What a while it is since you came to see us—months, I believe.’

‘Months, I know,’ thought I, but I did not say so. ‘It will all be the fresher to me. And who have you at the house now?’ I asked.

‘Oh, those shooting people, the Grants, and Miss Hopwood, that’s all.’

‘Miss Hopwood with you yet? She’s been with you all the summer, hasn’t she?’

‘Yes; pretty nearly.’

‘Do you like her, Cecilia?’ I asked, after a little pause that came over us both simultaneously.

‘No,’ she said frankly, ‘I don’t like her, and I think you will not.’

‘Then why do you keep her so long?’

'To tell you the truth, I scarcely know how to get rid of her. She's convenient to have at times, to entertain the people when I'm tired out, for I'm getting terribly tired of such a constant bustle, and she knows how to make herself agreeable. She's stylish too, and Thomas likes stylish women.'

Cecilia said all this quickly, and with an affectation of indifference, but I was not deceived. I saw she was annoyed with Miss Hopwood, and I said, 'Take my advice, and send her home.'

'She cannot go now till after the party. She and I are to have dresses alike. Thomas has bought us a handsome silk a-piece. He thinks we're a little indebted to her, as she takes the care and trouble from me at times.'

'She's poor then?'

'Well, she isn't rich. Not rich enough to refuse a new silk dress, especially if it's a handsome one. Her friends are respectable, though, and she has quite a large acquaintance. We got to know the Grants through her.'

'No great loss if you hadn't known *them*,' I said, abruptly.

'No. But Thomas is wonderfully taken up with them. He's out shooting with them most days. I tell him there soon won't be a partridge on the place.'

'What pleasure can gentlemen find in shooting poor harmless birds, Cissy? To me it seems stupid and cruel both. I don't know which most.' Cecilia looked grave. 'Tell Thomas so when you see him.'

'He would not listen to me, especially if his friends the Grants were by. But I will try him nevertheless.'

'What a life this is!' I exclaimed involuntarily. 'The company of frivolous people, and the shooting of birds that God has made to be happy and free! Does he never think of anything higher? Do you never think of anything higher, Cecilia?'

'Sometimes,' she said, with a sigh. 'But of what use is it thinking?'

'A great deal; if thinking leads to acting. You didn't always think life was made for nothing but fine dress and fine company. You had desires after something better and nobler, and you used to talk of the good you would do when you were married and had a home of your own. Why don't you act out those good desires?'

Cecilia looked uncomfortable and conscience-stricken, and the tears rose to her eyes as she replied, 'It is so difficult! But I think I could do better, if Thomas would let me.'

'Don't wait for Thomas,' I answered. 'Begin at once

yourself. You wait for the river going by, I fear, if you wait for him to begin a change ; let him see you determined for a better life for yourself, and draw him after you, if you can. If not —'

I paused ; but she asked anxiously, 'And what, if not ?'

'Then you must walk the upper road alone. Of what use is it that both of you should sink ? But I think if you were truly in earnest, and he saw it, he has love enough for you, and respect enough for what is good, to follow you.'

'I wish I thought so ! But you don't know all that opposes. It isn't only gay company and shooting that stand in the way. There's something else.' And she looked gloomily at the opposite wall.

I spared her the confession, for I thought I knew what she meant. 'Yes,' I said, 'there's something else that he's getting to love better than noble living. Mind he doesn't get to love it better than yourself ! He will do in a while, if you do not make a stand for him and for yourself, for alcohol is a jealous companion, and will have no rivals, and the nearest and dearest have to give way to it. You know how it shortened his father's life, how it ruined his fair name, and how it dragged down his better nature into the mire of sensuality ; but then, in his latter days, he had no wife to stay his sliding footsteps, no one near him to be his better angel !'

Cecilia went home without the smile that had enlivened her face on entering my cottage, but I did not regret that I had chased it from her lips. It was time, I thought, that she began a more truly thoughtful life, and looked at her responsibilities fairly. A butterfly existence is perhaps the only possible one for some natures ; she was formed for something more important.

The chaise was sent for me early on the wedding-day, for I had to help to adorn the drawing-room, and to give general advice to servants and mistress when necessary. At least this was what Cecilia said, though my office of helper was all but a sinecure, and of adviser, quite so, as I found flowers and china arranged not far from perfection beforehand, and each servant at her place quite understanding the work before her. Miss Hopwood had anticipated me in various little works that I had been in the habit of performing on similar occasions, and there was nothing for me to do but to sit lazily in an easy chair till dinner time, and comment inwardly upon what I saw before me. The house had been partly refurnished since I had been there before ; there were some luxurious lounges and settees set here and there about the drawing-room, of hitherto unknown form and shape to me ; a few expensive pictures and

flower vases that displayed themselves with an air and told you they were just imported, and a new grand piano instead of the walnut cottage that had seemed so all-sufficient a few years before. I did not quarrel with these things; I only hoped the farm was prospering, and wondered whether so much additional grandeur had added to the happiness of its possessors. Miss Hopwood proved to be a tall, dark-haired young lady, without beauty of face, but with a certain self-asserting grace about her, difficult to describe. She was dressed with a good deal of effect, and though her silk dress was exactly of the colour and quality of her hostess's, it managed to shine with greater lustre and to fall in better folds. Not that Cecilia's was wanting in fit or handsomeness; away from Miss Hopwood's it seemed all but perfection; nearer, it took duller, commoner lights and shadows. And the same might be said of its wearer when she sat or stood by the plain-looking young lady. I thought Cecilia seemed aware of the unfavourable comparison, and was at the same time repelled and attracted by her easy guest. Now and then a slight shadow of discontent flitted across her brow, but it did not stay long,—she recalled her cheerfulness with an effort. Was not this her wedding-day, on which she must appear full of smiles and enjoyment?

At dinner I was introduced to the shooting friends of Thomas Grey, the two brothers Grant, young men with loud voices, and broad, brawny shoulders; with exceptionally red faces, and with hair and whiskers of a still redder hue, of the true colour and build for men of the gun and the chase. It was not at all a formal dinner, with made dishes and solemn waiters to perplex and silence plain people, but a cheerful, substantial meal, with not too much ceremony or gravity about it. Jokes went round very freely, and nobody was thought the worse for a hearty laugh. The clergyman and his two sisters were genial, friendly people, and the doctor was proverbial for hilarity on festive occasions. The other guests were easy, well-content people, whom a little served to amuse. Miss Hopwood did more than her share to entertain my niece's visitors, but this was almost necessary, as both Thomas and Cecilia seemed pre-occupied and ill at ease, though they strove hard to conceal it. They had to play the parts of a happy couple who could congratulate and be congratulated with perfect pleasure, but I, who knew them well, saw that they were not just then the people they wished to appear to be. What was it that had made them thus uncomfortable? Had Cecilia been trying to inculcate temperance against her husband's wish? If so, she had been unsuccessful in obtaining present

good result, for when the gentlemen joined us in the drawing-room after dinner, more than one of them had overstepped the limits of true sobriety. Thomas Grey was overflowing with a sort of politeness that comes to some men from frequent use of the contents of the bottle, and his face was radiant with un-suppressed self-content. He had for a time forgotten all annoyances; and could I have forgotten whence he derived his geniality, I might have had genuine pleasure in the change. He looked handsome as of old, with the bright colour on his cheeks and the bright light in his eye, and was now as warmly attentive to his wife, as he had lately been constrained and cold. But she received his attentions with little pleasure, and soon slipped away from him and them, with a mortified expression, and a look of sadness in her downcast eyes. She did not venture to glance towards me, and I was too sorry for her to wish that she should.

Then came tea and the young people and the dance, and everybody was merry and gay, at least in appearance. We older folk sat and looked on, and Cecilia remained with us after one dance with the doctor. But her husband found dancing more agreeable, and he and Miss Hopwood were partners time after time, to their great content. She was much admired for her elegant dancing, and he seemed glad to be admired at her side, and expressed his gladness in rather a boisterous way. I grew tired in a while of the motion and the music, and retreated to a quiet corner of the distant breakfast-room, where one lamp and a small fire gave me a pleasant, subdued welcome after so much noise and glare. I had taken the privilege of a relative and an old woman, and did not wish to be disturbed, so I took the precaution of shutting the door behind me, and, leaning back in a roomy chair, should soon, perhaps, have fallen asleep had not a sudden irruption on my silence disturbed me. It was caused by Cecilia's entrance. Her face was very pale, and its expression gloomy. She did not see me, but going quickly to the table, where stood some decanters and glasses, she proceeded to pour out for herself a glass of wine, and at once to drink it off, and this she did again and again with a feverish, and, to me, very frightful sort of eagerness. There was no pause or stay between each glass further than was necessary to pour it full. I counted four glasses thus swallowed, and then as a fifth was being poured out I recovered from my astonishment, and thought it quite time to let her know of my presence. 'Cecilia!' I exclaimed, in a tone of surprise. She put down the glass which she had just lifted, with a start. 'What are you doing?' I asked.

A quick flush of shame dyed her cheeks, and I saw her

hand tremble, but she managed to reply, 'Drowning trouble, aunt !'

'Drowning trouble ? You are bringing it on ! Are you in the habit of taking wine in this way ? What does it mean ?'

'It means I am unhappy—very unhappy ; and if I'm to keep up any longer I must have something. I came here to be alone.'

'Alone ! To drink ! And would that make it any better ? Oh, Cecilia, you are going to the wrong comforter ! But what makes you so unhappy ?'

'I can't tell you now ; it's a long tale. But don't look so shocked. I don't often do in this way !'

This assurance was no comfort to me, as it told me that this was not the first time she had tried to drown trouble in wine. '*I don't often do in this way !*' She had sometimes then done so before. I looked at her in silent dismay. Only seven years married this very day, if, indeed, the day was not already past, and already seeking to drown trouble in wine ! There was, too, a sort of desperate putting off of shame in her avowal that was exceedingly painful to me. How many more glasses would she have taken if I had not interrupted her ? One or two, or perhaps four, more ? But no, she could surely not intend to intoxicate herself. Alas ! how could I tell how many she might not now be able to drink without doing that ?

She had sat down, or rather sunk down, upon a chair while these thoughts were passing through my mind ; and with her hands before her face seemed to be awaiting further words from me. Was it despair or shame that made her hide her face ? I could not believe it was the first, and took courage when I thought it might be the last. I rose up, and putting my hand upon her shoulder, said, 'Why did not you come to me for comfort, Cissy ? I should have made a better consoler than wine can be. Or if your trouble could not be told to human ears, why not to God ? His ears are always open to your cry.'

She murmured something, but I could not tell what, and then rose up suddenly, wiped away some tears that had just started into her eyes, and left me alone. She had gone back to her company, where I suppose she thought her presence was needed. In a little while I followed her, and saw her standing with a smile upon her lips, bidding the curate and his sisters good night.

'We've had a very pleasant evening, I'm sure !' said the doctor's wife, as she pinned up her gown for her walk home.

'I'm so glad !' said Cecilia.

'Such a pleasure to see such a happy couple ! I always say

to Mr. Tucker, where will you see a happier couple than at Dale House? You're quite an example to the country, my dear Mrs. Grey! If everybody were like you we might send the Divorce Court to Jericho. Mr. Tucker always says, where will you find such a couple?" And the old lady looked up at Cecilia with very shining and very silly eyes, that, with her speeches, made me wonder whether the wine had not been just a little too much for her. But, to be sure, my mind just then was running upon wine.

"We're much obliged to you and Dr. Tucker," was the reply.

"Yes, my dear, you are indeed, if you knew all! And when shall we be seeing you at the Firs? Now don't say you're too busy, for I won't hear it; you never come!"

As I said, or meant to say, we had not too much gentility or ceremony at this little festal gathering, and, I think, not much penetration, for all seemed pleased and satisfied with host and hostess, though, of course, in a while afterwards everybody was saying, "I knew something was wrong at the time; Mrs. Grey, poor thing, was not quite herself." But I am anticipating.

The next day Cecilia was taken ill; the exertion of the previous day had been too much for her, it was said, though I must confess I did not believe it. Bodily exertion, which was what was meant, was always good for her, and she had certainly not had too much of that. As I hastened to her bedside, I had many painful thoughts, anticipating a confession from her of humiliation and trouble. "What is it, my dear?" I asked, as I held her feverish hand in mine, and looked anxiously in her face for the answer. "What ails you?"

The tears rose up in her large, overlight eyes, as she replied with some difficulty, "I want to tell you, but I don't know how to begin! I have been very foolish and very wicked! Sit down, there, behind the curtain, please, then I shan't see you, and you won't see me, while I tell you."

I did so, and she went on. "It's more than a year ago since all this misery began. Till about that time I had confidence in Thomas's settled love for me, and though he wasn't all I wished, yet I think his heart never went away from me. But he was getting very fond of the companionship of farmers who could smoke cigars and drink spirits, and of gentlemen of the same kind also; the more they could do these things, the better he liked them. At least it seemed so to me, and sometimes I complained to him how much of his time and his money and his health were being wasted by such society. But after laughing at me a little for my squeamishness, he would say, sometimes, "The fact is, Cissy, a man wants something more than tea and slops when he's

been riding about the farm half the day, and I'm tired to death of the milk and water women that you get about you here, and must have society that'll put a little life into me. **A man wants to be with men."** I thought of these words a good deal, though I didn't quite believe them all, because I saw that it was the spirits and the wine that he cared much more for, than even men's society, and I determined to get about me some one who should not be milk and water—some lady companion or other who should help me to wean him from a dangerous habit. I ought to have consulted you, dear aunt, about all this, but my pride wouldn't let me do it ; it wouldn't let me confess to you, as I must have done to make you understand my position, that my marriage was a failure. You had withstood it for so many years, and had always prophesied some ill end to our union, for you knew Thomas in those days better than I did, that I could not bear to have to confess to you my discomfort, and my husband's growing partiality for drink. Then, too, I didn't like to tell you his little speech about milk and water women ; it would seem to you, I thought, that he meant a personal disparagement, though I don't believe that he thought of you at all when he said it. It seemed to me the wisest plan to get some spirited lady-friend who should help me to win the battle against the bottle, and I congratulated myself very much when I persuaded Miss Hopwood to make this house her home for a while. She was not handsome, so much the better ; but she was talented and gay, ready to amuse, full of life and animation, and as we both disliked the incessant smell of spirits and cigars in the house, we waged war against them with what we thought proper and lady-like weapons. Miss Hopwood could follow the hounds, talk politics, write poetry, and entertain guests, and at first I thought her perfection, and just the help that I wanted. My plan seemed to succeed. The cigar smoking, spirit drinking, farmers were less and less to be seen in our house, and only those gentlemen came that had some intellectual qualifications. Thomas sat for fewer hours in the dining-room, and more in the drawing-room. I could once more make sure of his presence with me of an evening, and I was at some pains to get about me lively fashionable people that he could not by any possibility call humdrum. You must have noticed how much gayer we have been this last summer. I did not feel that it was exactly the best thing to do, for of course our expenses increased, but then, it seemed the only possible thing to wean Thomas from -something worse. And, I thought, we have no children to provide for, so that it matters

less how much we spend. It was all very false reasoning, very unwise, for I was only plucking up one weed to plant another, even if I succeeded. I was giving him one false excitement for another, that was all. And my plan did not succeed, for though less wine and spirits were drunk, it was only because a rather newer pleasure had for a while taken their place. He was fond of music, and Miss Hopwood's songs pleased him better than mine; her voice, perhaps, also. I didn't think of that at first, but by-and-by it struck me painfully. Then, she could at any time bring a smile upon his face; and I began to perceive that I had no such power. He would always be ready to accompany her on walk or drive; but he had twenty excuses if I desired his company. Do you see it all? I began to grow jealous, and fretful, and suspicious, and sadly wanted to dismiss my guest; but when I attempted it, I found I could not do so without making a scene—a thing I hated. How often I longed and yearned to tell you all! I have been on the eve of it time after time, but something always prevented me, either my pride or my shame, or want of fit opportunity. Yes, I began to despair in a while. I saw myself encompassed about in my own net, and could not escape; and then to soothe the bitter moment I took wine, more and more. It helped me over many a crisis. It made me forget for a while. But I cannot tell you how I hated and despised myself for this weakness. I, who had thought to cure my husband, to fall into the same evil habit! I, who had preached so against it to you—to Miss Hopwood—to everybody! You may imagine the state of mind I was in sometimes. But I am tired of this long tale, and too ill to go into details. So I will pass on till the day before yesterday, when I determined to have it out with Thomas. I had been longing to talk to him ever since you and I had spoken of my duty; what I ought to do for him. Ah! you did not know what I ought to do for myself, or you would have given me a more severe lesson! I told him that I was intending to give Miss Hopwood notice to go home to her friends. He asked what for? I said that it would be better for my peace of mind that she went, and for his honour. He went into a furious passion, and accused me of unreasonable jealousy. He said she was the only sensible person in the house, and if I sent her away I must expect him to go too, or something to that effect. He would not have been so angry, and said so much, only that he had been with the drink; but I was foolish enough to dare him to go, for I also was not quite myself. I had been obliged to take wine to get over the

wretched day. And then—he struck me! and—I know I shall die!

Here she showed me a sad sight, a bruised and discoloured breast, very much swollen, and very painful. Shocked, I drew back, exclaiming, ‘And you concealed this all yesterday? You let us come and go without a word about it! How you must have suffered, my poor child! What a cruel thing; this is frightful!’ And then seeing her state of excitement I began to soothe, and recommended that Dr. Tucker should at once be sent for. But she would not hear of it. ‘No,’ she said, decidedly, ‘how can I send for Dr. Tucker and tell him that my husband struck me! And if I did not tell him he would find it out. It is impossible. I must bear it without that. You know some remedy, don’t you? Though, indeed, it will never be cured—never! ’

I applied arnica, and in a while she was soothed and in less pain, and could tell me more of her trouble, which I allowed her to do, seeing that it was a relief to her mind to pour out her long concealed grief. And first I asked her if Miss Hopwood knew all the mischief she was causing by her presence? ‘If she does not, she is very blind,’ was the answer, ‘though of course she doesn’t know about this’—pointing to her breast, ‘but she must know how unhappy she makes me by her attentions to Thomas; she must have seen—’

‘Have you ever said anything to her directly about it?’

‘Not directly. I scorned to let her see that I cared for her.’

I thought if my poor Cecilia had scorned other and worse things, it would have been much better for her, but I said, quietly, ‘If so, it is quite possible she is not aware, and is innocent of any great wrong. She has been imprudent,—worse than imprudent, perhaps,—but she may not be guilty of what you fear—a desire and determination to take Thomas’s affections away from you.’

‘She must be aware!’ Cecilia said, with vehement bitterness.

I knew how unjust jealousy frequently makes its unhappy victim, so I did not pay too much attention to her words, but concluded to have an interview with the young lady, and get her at once to leave the house, whether innocent or guilty. It was certainly high time that she was away; so, towards evening, when my niece had sunk into a feverish slumber, I left her as gently as possible, and made my way to the drawing-room. Here was Miss Hopwood alone, reading a novel that had just come from the library. ‘How is Mrs. Grey,’ she asked, when I entered the room; ‘it is so strange that she

will not let me see her or nurse her !' I looked keenly at her, to find whether this speech was from an unsuspecting heart, or a wily one, but her face told me very little. She had attained the polite accomplishment of the smile that sits upon the countenance at once as an ornament and a veil, and I did not know what to make of her. But I walked boldly up to her, seated myself by her side, and entered into explanations that must have been very painful, if she had a feeling heart, and that certainly were very surprising, according to her own account. Her novel dropped from her knee, and her hands were soon clasped in a sort of ecstasy of wonder. 'But my dear lady, how could I suppose so ?' was her chief exclamation and question ; 'I had no idea that Mrs. Grey was of so jealous a temper !' 'No, perhaps not,' was my answer, 'but now that you do know, you cannot fail also to see what is the right thing for you to do.' 'You mean that I must go away ?' The polite smile had vanished, and a momentary expression of dismay and anxiety had crossed her face, as though she were wondering what home was open to her elsewhere ; but she rose up at once, and with a slight and hasty arrangement of her dress (she was always very particular about her appearance), said, hastily, 'Can I have Jane to help me to pack up ?'

When she had left the house, which she did without much ceremony or leave-taking, I repaired to the sick room, and found Cecilia awake. It was a great relief to her to find that Miss Hopwood was gone, but she shed some bitter tears over the humiliation of the last few days. 'She will tell all her friends !' she exclaimed, weakly. 'She will scarcely do that, for her own sake,' was my reply. 'Oh, she will make her own side out to be all right, and mine——' 'All wrong, you mean ? Well, we cannot help that ; time will show which was the side of truth and right.' 'You think she is innocent, aunt ; I can see you do ! You believe her tale, and not mine !' And as Cecilia said this, she rose up in bed, and looked at me with wild feverish earnestness. 'Lie down, dear ! We will not talk about it now ; though I think you ought to be glad to believe that your suspicions are without very serious foundation. I think if you had not flown to the wine as a comforter you would have seen all this sad affair more calmly, and have saved yourself much needless anguish.'

She lay down again, and became very silent, but I saw the tears rolling slowly down her cheeks on to the pillow. I let them flow unnoticed, really glad to see them. Such trouble as hers must have an outlet, and such tears were the best relief. When evening closed in, I sought Thomas Grey, and had a long and serious conversation with him. He was inclined

to be offended and moody. My sudden dismissal of Miss Hopwood had not pleased him, but it was no time to care for his displeasure. I set before him faithfully the picture of his errors ; warned him of the further ill consequences that might ensue, and asked him whether he would not now make a stand, and strive after a new and better life. His coldly averted face turned towards me at last, when I showed him that I knew the cause of Cecilia's illness, and besought him as he loved her and himself to give up entirely intoxicating drinks. 'Have they not been the great exciting cause of all this misery ?' I asked. He could not say No. But he did as so many others do, he put from him all thoughts of amendment, and said it was impossible to live without them. No doubt he thought his wife's illness temporary, and that she would soon be well, and all things would go on as usual ; and no doubt, too, my warnings were looked upon by him as the morbid fears of a nervous woman. He was sorry for what he had done, but not with the sorrow of true repentance.

Cecilia never recovered the blow given in his drunken anger. It is true she lingered for two years longer, but died at last worn out by the agonising sufferings of cancer ; her youth and health and strength brought down to the grave by a disease that might never have reached her but for drink. She lived to be sincerely repentant of her own folly, but she had not the satisfaction of seeing her husband a reformed man. He had fits of remorse and self-reproach, but they were soon over, and the old comforter—the bottle, was ever near at hand, with its magical drinks, to put conscience to sleep, and to bring from the dark recesses of the world of evil, those deceiving ghosts of happiness and animal pleasure that the drunkard mistakes for and embraces as angels of light. When his wife died, the farm was found to be unremunerative ; it had, in fact, been so for some years, and as his expenses had been beyond his income, he had to leave it with straitened means. With the wreck of his property he left England for Australia, and died on the passage ;—*how*, I have always dreaded to inquire.

---

## STATISTICAL DATA FOR SOCIAL REFORMERS.

## CONSUMPTION OF CORN IN THE PRODUCTION OF INTOXICATING DRINKS IN 1868.

THE malt officially reported as used in brewing and distilling in 1868 was 54,337,583 bushels, which may be treated as equivalent to as many bushels of barley; for though eight bushels of barley make (by the swelling of the grain) nine of malt, yet the Excise officers grant an allowance which brings down the quantity of malt rated to nearly about the bulk of barley used. Of this malt the amount consumed in making spirits was 4,549,813 bushels, which produced (reckoning 18 gallons to eight bushels) 10,237,073 gallons; but the spirits produced, excluding the methylated sorts, amounted to 22,664,575 gallons; so that in the manufacture of the remaining 12,427,502 gallons, the unmalted corn consumed was 5,523,328 bushels. The bushels of grain thus consumed were, therefore, in the aggregate 59,860,911; and if an estimate is made for the probable growth of grain on land used in hop-planting (64,386 acres, producing 2,317,896 bushels)—and for the grain substituted by sugar in brewing (351,742 cwt., equal to 1,500,768 bushels)—we have from these calculations the following result:

	Bushels.
Corn used in brewing in 1868 .....	49,787,770
Corn used in distilling in 1868 .....	10,073,141
Hop land might have produced in 1868 .....	2,317,896
Sugar used in brewing, equal to .....	1,500,768
 Loss of corn in brewing and distilling in 1868... .....	 63,679,575

This result, it will be seen, is irrespective of the waste of fruit in the manufacture of cider, perry, and British wines; nor does it touch upon the waste of grapes, sugar, and other nutritious substances used in the manufacture of intoxicating drinks (rum, brandy, geneva, and wines) imported into the British Islands in 1868.

The amount of food represented by 63,679,575 bushels of grain is extraordinary. In bulk it is about as much as the annual corn produce of Scotland (excluding seed reserved). If this

enormous quantity were divided among the whole population, in families of five persons, it would allow 10 bushels of corn for every family. A bushel is calculated to yield wholesome food equal to 15 four pound loaves; so that the 4lb. loaves thus produced, would, in the total, amount to nearly a thousand millions (955,193,625)—or 150 loaves to every family in the United Kingdom. If the distribution were confined to one family in four, 600 loaves would be assigned to each such family;—no inconsiderable yearly allowance, in itself, of the staff of life. It may be said that much of the grain used in brewing and distilling would not be available for consumption as bread, because not palatable to the people of this country. Though this may be true, the fact as to the destruction of so much nutritious grain is not affected; and the land on which this corn now grows would certainly be available for the growth of varieties of food which would enter directly, or indirectly, into the household consumption of the population at large. The truth remains, as declared by Dr. Erasmus Darwin more than two generations ago—“The food of the people is taken and converted into poison.”

## THE JUDICIAL STATISTICS FOR 1867-8.

The bulky document in light-blue cover which bears the title, ‘The Judicial Statistics of England and Wales for 1868,’ really refers to the year ending Sept. 29th, 1868. The police employed numbered 25,832 (an increase of 1,759 in the year), at a cost (all expenses included) of £2,084,596. 11s. 5d. The persons known to belong to the criminal classes, including tramps and vagrants, prostitutes, and ‘suspected persons,’ were 118,390, of whom 16,074 were under sixteen years of age; the males were 69,190, and the females 49,200. The total number for 1866-7 was 112,403. The houses of bad character are returned as 20,080. Of these, 5,730 are stated to be ‘the resorts of thieves and prostitutes,’ and in this number are found 2,037 public-houses and 2,117 beershops. The public-houses with this black brand are three per cent. of the licensed houses, all of whom are legally supposed to be in the hands of fit and proper owners. The

indictable crimes known to have been committed in the year were 59,080, but the persons apprehended were only 29,529; males 22,817, females 6,712. Of the whole number, 20,108 were committed for trial. The cases of murder were 129, and attempts to murder 61. The cases of manslaughter were 245. The number of cases proceeded against summarily (i.e., before local magistrates) were 490,752, and the convictions were 347,458; of males 288,117, of females 59,341. The cases proceeded against were more by 16,087 than those of 1866-7, and the convictions were 12,099 more, and the proportion of female cases was greater. The convictions were followed by 215,174 fines, and 87,364 terms of imprisonment, varying from fourteen days to above six months. The cases of assault were 92,978, of which 2,690 were 'aggravated assaults on women and children.' The cases of drunk and disorderly conduct were 111,465, making, with the assaults, a total of 204,443, or 42 per cent. of the whole number, in almost the whole of which strong drink was the instigating cause of the offence. The cases of drunk and disorderly for several years are given below, with their percentage of the total summary charges:—

1863-4	.....	100,067	... 23 per cent.
1864-5	.....	105,310	... 23 "
1865-6	.....	104,368	... 22 "
1866-7	.....	100,357	... 21 "
1867-8	.....	111,465	... 23 "

In the classification of 'character' 577 habitual drunkards (475 males, 102 females) are returned as apprehended for indictable offences, and 33,902, (25,573 males, 8,329 females) as proceeded against summarily; but it is explained that these 'habitual drunkards' are not among those otherwise classed as known 'thieves,' 'prostitutes,' 'vagrants,' 'suspicious characters,' 'previous good character,' 'character unknown.' It is a notable fact that of the indictable offences 6,756 (24 per cent.), and of the summary cases 187,694 (38 per cent.), were charged against persons of 'previous good character,' besides nearly an equal number ascribed to persons of 'character unknown'; and putting these together we have a total of 371,144 cases out of 520,281 arising from the misconduct of men and women who might have been supposed as unlikely to commit crime as the rest

of the community. Why they did commit it is explained in five cases out of six by the public-house and beer-shop. The inquests of the year were 24,774 (on males 17,476, on females 7,298), and in 320 cases (13 in the 1,000) the verdict of 'excessive drinking' was returned. Among the other verdicts were 261 of murder, 235 of manslaughter, 1,546 of suicide, 11,033 of accidental death, 2,824 of found dead, while 8,094 are ascribed to causes unnamed. But for the action of intoxicating drink, it may be safely concluded that these nearly 25,000 inquests would have dropped to one-half. The inquests for 1866-7 were 24,648. Among the inquests of 1867-8, no fewer than 6,796 were on children of seven years and under, and of these children 1,348 were illegitimate. The costs of the inquests were £76,520. 2s. 7d., an average of £3. 1s. 9d. a case. The number of prisoners was 158,480 (males 121,086, females 37,394), of whom 1,800 were under twelve years of age. The daily average of persons imprisoned was 18,677, and the highest number in prison at one time was 23,098. The deaths were 200—no discredit to the abstinence regimen imposed upon the prisoners, whatever have been their previous habits. The prison officers of all grades were 2,509, and the prison expenses of all kinds for the year were £691,378. 19s. 7d., of which only £49,180. 10s. 6d. were repaid by profits of prisoners' labour, &c. The convict prisons, which are separately grouped, had 9,906 inmates during the year, who were under the supervision of 1,362 officers, in establishments that cost £257,307. 5s. 7d. The offenders in custody in reformatory during the year were 5,437, supported at a cost to the nation of £62,309, in addition to which there is an industrial school at Feltham, Middlesex, which had 591 in detention, and 52 other certified industrial schools, with 3,684 children. There were also 953 criminal lunatics under detention during the year, at a cost of £35,753. 1s. 8d. It may be interesting to present some of the statistics in regard to apprehensions of persons drunk, or drunk and disorderly, the total number of which in the year ending September 29, 1867, was 111,465. The selections have respect to places having a population according to the census of 1861 of 20,000 and upwards. One caution, and

it is of the greatest importance, must first be given—that the returns do not offer a means of strict comparison between the various cities and boroughs, as there is no uniform police rule relative to apprehending drunken persons, or their registration as such. Of course only a small proportion of the drunk and drunk and disorderly persons in any town are ever apprehended:—

District.	Population in 1861.	Apprehensions for drunk and drunkardly conduct in the year ending Sept. 29, 1868.	Macclesfield .....	36,101 .....	78
Metropolitan district (including a radius of 15 miles round Charing Cross, except the City of London).....	3,109,172	18,872	South Shields ...	35,239 .....	655
Liverpool .....	443,938	14,451	Ashton-under-Lyne .....	34,886 .....	402
Manchester .....	388,722	9,540	Great Yarmouth .....	34,810 .....	129
Birmingham .....	296,076	2,310	Tynemouth .....	34,021 .....	406
Leeds .....	207,165	1,364	Exeter.....	33,738 .....	43
Sheffield .....	185,172	1,022	Gateshead .....	33,587 .....	414
Bristol .....	154,098	814	Cardiff .....	32,954 .....	360
City of London .....	112,063	446	Northampton.....	32,813 .....	170
Newcastle-on-Tyne .....	109,108	1,752	Worcester .....	31,227 .....	253
Bradford .....	136,218	285	Chester .....	31,110 .....	473
Salford .....	100,449	637	Carlisle .....	29,417 .....	189
Hull .....	97,661	963	Oxford.....	27,560 .....	11
Portsmouth .....	94,546	289	Warrington .....	26,431 .....	836
Preston .....	82,985	875	Cambridge .....	26,361 .....	65
Sunderland .....	78,211	600	Dover .....	25,325 .....	134
Brighton.....	77,693	148	Reading.....	25,045 .....	154
Norwich .....	74,891	103	Stalybridge.....	24,921 .....	311
Nottingham .....	74,693	179	Colchester .....	23,809 .....	63
Oldham .....	72,333	528	Wakefield .....	23,350 .....	150
Bolton .....	70,395	1,217	Newport (Wales). .	23,249 .....	347
Leicester.....	68,065	304	Maidstone .....	23,016 .....	36
Blackburn .....	63,126	886	Peterborough.....	22,893 .....	25
Plymouth .....	62,599	367	Hastings.....	22,383 .....	54
Wolverhampton .....	60,860	338	Huddersfield .....	22,163 .....	317
Stockport .....	54,682	893	Shrewsbury .....	22,163 .....	196
Birkenhead.....	52,958	398	Canterbury.....	21,224 .....	47
Bath .....	52,528	216	Lincoln .....	20,999 .....	67
Devonport .....	50,440	53		7,534,857	69,146
Southampton .....	46,088	280	Population 1861	Arrests for drunkenness and drunken disorder.	Number to population.
Derby .....	43,091	262	In police dis- tricts as above .....	7,534,857 .....	69,146 .....
Swansea .....	41,606	220	In rest of Eng- land and Wales.....	12,531,367 .....	42,319 .....
Coventry.....	40,936	159	1 to 109	1 to 296	
York .....	40,433	289	All England and Wales. .	20,066,224 .....	111,465 .....
Rochdale.....	38,114	743	1 to 180		
Ipswich .....	37,950	120			
Walsall .....	37,760	100			
Wigan .....	37,658	442			
Halifax .....	37,014	296			

The disproportions between population and apprehensions in the foregoing list are remarkable, and cannot all be referred to a difference in the prevalence of intemperance. It is probable that in many cases disorderly conduct connected with drunkenness has been classed among common assaults. Some towns of less than 10,000 inhabitants in 1861 are returned as having more police-charged drunkards among them than towns with seven times their population. That they are seven times as drunken as the others is out of the question.

In the year ending September 29, 1868, 12,197 publicans and beersellers were proceeded against for violations of the express conditions under which they carry on their trade. In this

number of law-breakers it appears that there were 8,222 beersellers represented, and 3,975 publicans. The same persons were, in not a few cases, proceeded against more than once; but as many more escaped legal process altogether, it may be assumed that at least that number of individuals were charged with offences, the proof of which ought

to have disqualified them for a renewal of the confidence reposed in them when their licences were first granted. But it is matter of universal notoriety, that the forfeiture of a public-house or beer-shop licence rarely occurs. How the magisterial jurisdiction over beersellers conferred by the new Act will be exercised has yet to be fully tested.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

*The Scottish Poor Law, and some Contrasts between the Principles and the Practices that have grown upon it.* Read 28th May, 1869, by D. Curror, late Chairman of Edinburgh Parochial Board. Edinburgh : Seton and MacKenzie.

MR. CURROR is an earnest poor-law reformer, and brings to bear on the subject extensive practical knowledge and much good sense. He distinguishes between three classes of poor. He sets on one side the voluntarily idle able-bodied, as deserving, not food, but rather branding and stripes. He would show them no mercy. Let them starve! He places quite apart from them the 'honest impotent poor,' for whom really efficient provision must be made out of the poor-rate; and the enfeebled poor, who are able to work little, and for whom suitable work should be found. He declares that not only, as at present, lands and heritages, but, as formerly, the means and substance of all the parish, should be assessed to the rate. 'Lands and heritages do not represent more than half of the material wealth of Scotland. That half at present discharges a whole national burden, and the other half goes free. That is not right. Take an example of the class. An ostensible proprietor of £10,000 worth of land has it burdened with a bond and disposition for £8,000. The return from land is not very great. The nominal proprietor, happen what may, must meet the interest, taxes, and rates applicable to the £10,000 value. But all the risks of income attach to the last £2,000 of heritable worth. He runs these risks, and lives upon very short commons indeed. But out of that bare living,—an appearance to keep up without the means,—probably 'remembering days of joy when misery is at hand,

he pays all the poor-rates; and the real owner of the land—the bondholder—pays ne'er a rap to maintain the poor. Incomes from manufactures, from stocks and shares, are all free. A millionaire of Moray Place pays only on his house, and his thousands invested otherwise than on land and heritages pay nothing. The poorest householder pays on his rent, and his sticks may be roused at the cross failing payment, and he and his may be driven to the poorhouse for shelter, while the thousands of our West-End friends pay nothing. The inequality is glaring.'

For the impotent deserving poor Mr. Curror would provide by reverting to the old law of settlement, to the extent of making the expense of him fall on his native parish, though not necessarily compelling him to live there. On becoming chargeable he may choose his place of residence once for all; but his native place must pay for his keep. Mr. Curror thinks the Registration Act has removed the difficulty of fixing the birth-settlement that led to that settlement's abolition. This plan would, he says, operate an equalisation of poor-rates, abolish the existing inequalities of pauper pressure on particular localities, and make the poor-rate, as near as may be, a national burden equally imposed in extinction of a national obligation, besides conferring other benefits. The impotent poor he would place in hospitals where they can be cared for with affectionate Christian earnestness. He would send them to the 'sunniest of the sunny poorhouses of the county, under the care of appropriate nurses.' The poor able to work a little he would send into the poorhouses happening to stand most convenient, 'with the most fitting facilities for enabling them to carry out their mission under appro-

priate Christian masters.' The poor, able but not willing, are to be made to work under pain of starvation. 'Send them to the house with the greatest facilities for enabling the parish to carry into effective operation its corrective discipline under appropriate regimen and taskmasters.' At present, 'there can be no proper or perfect classification in any one house, as no house admits of that perfect separation of "languages—barred tongues—voices deep and hoarse"—of the impotent—of the weak—and of the sturdy, that is necessary for the appropriate management and employment of each. But by giving each class a separate house, and classifying that class, a perfect classification could be made and maintained under proper heads. As all the parishes alike would participate in these benefits, let a common account be kept of cost, and divided among the parishes according to the number of paupers in each.' Mr. Curror adds:—'I can see no objection to such a re-arrangement of existing parochial machinery as this. Even although the parishes kept an account of each man's earning, and gave him the surplus over the cost of food and clothing, I could see no objection. But, on the contrary, I could see in that great gain to the parish and great benefit to the worker. Let a man work, and give him the return. If industrious and well-behaved, let him work his way out of the worst class into a better. Indeed, let him work himself out of the poorhouse altogether, with a trade learned, industrial habits, and a purse in his pocket, to start in the world when he gets out. Infuse into the system sympathy for the impotent, hopes of gain of means and respectability to the worker, with fears of being sent to a worse class and harder fare for the disobedient and idle. Let none be discharged without a certificate of merit for the outer world; and you will lop off this corrupt graft, make the poorhouse of the present day the hospital and correction-house of the old Act, and bring the treatment of the poor back to Christian injunction.'

'I am aware of the objection to reverting to the old Law—that it would send workhouse labour to compete in the market to the prejudice of the legitimate small trader. But the argument is overstrained. If, by means of this re-organisation, the poor are made to

eat their own bread, surely that is no inconsiderable gain to the small trader. But it is not necessary to bring poorhouse labour into competition with the ordinary trader at all. The pauper able to work a little would find himself fully occupied with the work required for the inmates of the poorhouse and the officials. The able to work could be employed in remunerative labour not yet in the market. Let Government lay out designs for draining, on proper engineering principles, the bogs and lakes, moors and mosses many of the country; and for reclaiming land from the sea and in similar works of a public nature, and thus extend the arable area of the nation, bringing food to the people, and employ the poor able to work in carrying out such improvements; and paupers, while learning industry, would benefit the nation, earn their own bread, and take the bread out of the mouth of no one.'

We have briefly indicated the course taken by Mr. Curror. The recommendations advanced in his pamphlet are not exhausted by our notice of them thus far, but the necessities of space forbid us to go farther.

*The Cure of Souls and Atrophy of Brains.* Dartmouth: Cranford.

We do not admire the tone and spirit of this pamphlet, one chief object of which is to expose what is called 'the odious position of the beneficed clergy in England, consuming as they do a portion of the national income in ease and luxury, which would suffice, and more than suffice, to instruct the poor.' The clergy are entitled to think in many cases that they are instructing the poor; and the well-known hardships of the curates, to say nothing of the self-denying labours of clergymen of many classes, rebuke this insolent accusation. Yet the writer is very clear-sighted in some respects. Whilst protesting against much that we find in his pamphlet, we cordially recognise the truth of his complaint, that sufficient attention is not paid to the intellectual advancement of the poor. He suggests that the Government should purchase all advowsons offered, on receiving proof in each case that the incumbent is sixty-five years of age or upwards, or that he has held the living not less than forty years, paying seven years' purchase on the gross annual value. On the first ensuing vacancy,

all the glebe, titles, residence, &c., to be sold, and the balance, after repaying the purchase money, interest, and expenses, capitalised, the interest to provide a suitable stipend for the minister, if the cure is retained; and the surplus to be given in aid of educational grants or rates. He notes very truly, that many livings or cures, owing to the prevalence of dissent, dwindling population, and other local circumstances, might and ought to be suppressed at the earliest opportunity. Well-known abuses abounding in connection with the Establishment supply him with too much opportunity for his rough satiric horseplay.

*The Disinfectant Question : Review of a Book by Dr. R. Angus Smith, entitled Disinfectants and Disinfection. Reprinted from the Sanitary Record.*  
London: M'Corquodale and Co., Cardington-street.

This is a rasping review of Dr. Angus Smith's book on Disinfectants and Disinfection. According to the *Chemical News*, 'no man living is competent to criticise Dr. Angus Smith on disinfection but Dr. Angus Smith himself;' and of his book, the same authority asserts that 'almost every page contains evidence of exhaustive laborious research, guided in its course by the clearest judgment. We seek in vain for some weak point to give us occasion to air our critical acumen.' But, according to the reviewer before us, Dr. Smith's book has one weak point of most glaring prominence and of most serious moment. The charge against Dr. Smith, in short, is that self-regard has rendered him altogether a biased and unsafe guide;—that being inventor of M'Dougall's disinfecting powder, he has suffered his judgment to be warped most egregiously in favour of that article. 'We are very far from saying,' remarks the reviewer, 'that it was not competent for the Cattle Plague Commission, relying upon the special knowledge of their medical and chemical members, to decide for themselves the question of the choice of disinfectants; but we will say and uphold that having, instead of so doing, publicly announced that the subject required further investigation, it was their duty, in selecting the person to conduct the inquiry, to see that the individual chosen was not only fully competent, but in no way biased by having been mixed up with the rivalries

of inventors and manufacturers. And we will further boldly assert that in the entire range of British scientific chemists they could not have singled out one more disqualified on the latter grounds than Dr. Angus Smith. That gentleman, however, having once been appointed and having thought himself justified in accepting the trust, could hardly, without belying his whole past career, do otherwise than recommend his own invention. But he ought to have done so in a straightforward and high-handed manner, and not condescended to make a pretence of being guided by fresh investigations, which, in reality, as the reports of the Commission show, had no influence on his conduct nor on their proceedings. It was still less worthy of the Commission, after having allowed themselves privately to give in their adhesion to disinfection by Dr. Smith's invention, to shuffle off their responsibility by permitting the empty forms of futile investigation to be gone through.' This is the gravamen of the charge brought by the reviewer against Dr. Angus Smith and the Cattle Plague Commission. It is supported by some very telling pleading, and a strong *prima facie* case is set up which demands a reply from the defendant. The pamphlet, we may add in conclusion, appears to be written in the combined interest of truth and Condy's fluid.

*Signs of the Times : An Address delivered by T. M. Morris, of Ipswich, at the Annual Meeting of the Suffolk and Norfolk Baptist Home Missionary Union, held at Bury St. Edmunds.*  
Published by request. London: E. Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

THE 'signs of the times,' to which Mr. Morris drew the attention of his hearers, were, first, 'impending and possible changes in the political ecclesiastical arrangements of this country;' and second, 'the drift of religious thought and sentiment towards Ritualism on the one hand, and Rationalism on the other.' The Established Church of England and Ireland, he predicts, will ere long share the fate of the Irish one. An era of free churches is before us. The probable coalescence of sundry 'evangelical' denominations with the 'evangelical' portion of the free church of England, leads Mr. Morris to apprehend that the Baptists may be called upon for a time to 'suffer from a keener sense of social

inferiority as a denomination' than that which they now labour under. Still, in the event of such coalescence, he opines there would be a greater call than ever for the faithful maintenance of distinctively Baptist principles. The ultimate issue of disestablishment and disendowment will, however, 'more than answer to our brightest expectations.' As regards Ritualism, he thinks the Baptists occupy a vantage ground shared by no other denomination; being free from the practise of pedo-baptism, which he describes to be an unintentional bolstering up of Ritualism. Lastly, he exhorts his hearers to confront with unshrinking zeal the advances of Rationalism.

*An Inquiry into the Causes of the Present Long-continued Depression in the Cotton Trade; with Suggestions for its Improvement.* By a Cotton Manufacturer. Manchester: John Heywood.

The author of this very valuable pamphlet is Mr. William Hoyle, a well-known manufacturer of Bury, who, being extensively engaged in the cotton trade, has of course had his attention very much drawn to the present sorely depressed condition of trade and manufacture in Lancashire and elsewhere; and has embodied in the pamphlet before us the result of his meditations thereupon. The conclusion he comes to, from the facts and figures of the cases, is that the fatal flaw in the state of the trade lies not in the condition of the foreign, but in that of the home market; and that if the home market were what it ought to be, the foreign would need to give little or no anxiety to the manufacturer. Mr. Hoyle's argument has been succinctly stated in the following letter to the chairman of a meeting on the stagnation of trade, held lately at the Clarence Hotel, in Manchester:—

'64, Mosley-street, Manchester, Sept. 14, 1869.

'Dear Sir,—I am glad to see that the state of trade in this country is attracting the attention of men of position and influence.

'Without at all presuming to offer any surmise as to what should be the course of procedure at the meeting this afternoon, I yet beg respectfully to call the attention of gentlemen assembled to what I believe to be, and what many other thoughtful men regard as, the

main cause of our present bad trade, and the one most inimical to the interests of the labouring classes.

'I can best explain the matter by stating two or three facts. In the year 1860 the home trade of this country bought cotton goods to the value of £12,129,000. In the year 1868 (last year), although the price of cotton goods was from 10 to 20 per cent. more than in 1860, yet the home trade only took cotton goods to the value of £6,911,000, or about half the quantity taken in 1860.

'It may be said this was owing to people being poorer; but, if so, how are we to explain the following facts? In the year 1860 the amount of money spent in the United Kingdom on intoxicating drink was £69,910,544; in the year 1868 the amount spent was £102,886,280, being in eight years an increase of £32,975,736 sterling, or about 47 per cent. To sum up, the home trade bought 50 per cent. less cotton goods and 47 per cent. more drink. If the 32 millions spent extra in drink last year over 1860 had been invested in manufactured goods we should not have had any stagnation in trade, for it would have cleared off all stock, and found employment for nearly half a million more persons than it did by being spent in intoxicating liquors. If three-fourths of the entire £102,886,280 had been laid out in manufactured goods, we should have had a roaring trade.

'There are other causes of bad trade, but this is the greatest of all, and I hope that, whatever programme for the future be laid out, gentlemen will not fail to include in it some plan for checking the enormous amount of intemperance and consequent pauperism which now prevail.—I remain, your obedient servant,

'WILLIAM HOYLE.'

The trade and the community at large owe much to Mr. Hoyle for having called attention to the real state of the case. The pamphlet is, as we have said, a very valuable one, and its circulation in large quantities is, on all accounts, very much to be desired.

*Seed Scattered Broadcast: or Incidents in a Camp Hospital.* By S. Mc.Beth.

With an Introduction, and edited by the Author of 'The Memorials of Captain Hedley Vickers,' &c. Pp. 344. London: William Hunt and Co., Holles-street, Cavendish Square.

DURING the late civil war in the United

States a large staff of volunteer workers—medical men, Christian ministers, Scripture readers, and women of all ranks,—followed the Northern camp, supplying the temporal needs of the sick and wounded of both armies, and attending, where possible, to their spiritual needs. Amongst the women was the lady of whose pen the volume before us is the fruit; and in a series of articles, mainly in dialogue form, she here gives samples of the sort of work done, with hints of its effects upon soldiers of different classes. Her ruling thought is that she is a recruiting officer for Christ's army; and her one work is to accost all and sundry, in season and out of season, when they like it and when they do not, and to endeavour to impress upon them the leading principles of her theologic system,—not, however, for the sake of the system, but in the hope of inducing them, by its means, to enrol themselves in the army of the Lord. Grant the truth of her system, and the justification of her action follows as a matter of course. We doubt not there are many Christians to whom the one will appear to be deplorably narrow and inadequate as a 'ground-plan of the All'; but there will be few genuine Christians, we think, who will not recognise in the action she took and the work she accomplished reason in abundance both for heartily admiring her earnestness and her tact in meeting various forms of opposition, and for rejoicing in the success she attained in inducing thoughtless, apathetic, or hostile minds to commence in earnest that Christian warfare with sin, in the absence of which life is but an unmeaning dream.

Many protests inevitably arise in the critic's mind as he examines the volume. A narrowness of system leads to great injustice. We have, to begin with, three chapters,—labelled, first, the Infidel; second, the Universalist; third, the Backslider. We hope it is abundantly possible for many persons who, like us, are not Universalists, to feel acutely, as we do, the grave insult that is here, though probably unconsciously, done to a rapidly-increasing class of Christians. Obviously, in every other respect a man might be a true Christian, answering even to S. McBeth's own definition of one, and yet be a Universalist. Is it right to brand a brother in Christ's army, because 'unsound'

only on the one point in which the most loving natures are the most liable to be misled? Yet here the Universalist is purposely transfixed on one skewer with the Infidel and the Backslider. It is quite true the particular Universalist here exhibited does not happen to deserve much better treatment; but he might have done; and the whole class to which he happened to belong should not have been thus abused by being sandwiched between the Backslider and the Infidel.

This is only one sample of the kind of protest aroused by a perusal of the book before us. Enough that we only just allude to the similarly provoking character of many things in the volume; adding the remark, that the triumphant progress of the argument is frequently due, not at all to the soundness of the reasoning, but solely to the inaptitude and inefficiency of the opponent. Amongst a more thoughtful class of men, this good lady would have met with a very different ending to some of her controversial adventures. But, making all due deductions for faults like these, there remains a volume which, to a very large class of minds, will appear to be full of irrefutable argument, produced with wonderful skill and tact, and often accomplishing results which all must agree to be in the highest degree salutary. It is impossible to follow the course of her labours, as shown in her book, without high admiration of the benevolent and conscientious courage, energy, and zeal thus manifested, or without feeling that in her capacity of recruiting-sergeant to the army of the Great King, she was fulfilling a function for which she was singularly well gifted.

*Words of Comfort for Parent's Bereaved of Little Children.* Edited by William Logan, Author of the Moral Statistics of Glasgow. With an Introductory Historical Sketch. By the Rev. Wm. Anderson, LL.D., of Glasgow. London: James Nisbet and Co., Berners-street.

We do not wonder that another and still another edition of this compilation have so soon been demanded. A collection of almost everything, whether in prose or verse, that has ever been well written in English, to comfort and help parents bereaved of children, forms a book to which the commonness of such

bereavement gives a strong claim for reception upon almost every home. The fourth edition, issued a few months ago, has been distributed strictly at cost price amongst more than 1,500 missionaries of all Protestant denominations—thanks to the combined liberality of Mr. Logan and other friends of the missionaries. A fifth and enlarged edition is fast finding its way, we doubt not, into some thousands of English and Scottish homes, there to be received, as it deserves, with no cold welcome. And a sixth edition is already out. This last, however, is an abridgment. It has been prepared in compliance with a wish, expressed by many, that the book should be published at a price making it more popularly accessible. Care has been taken to preserve whatever was essential to the original purpose of the compilation; and whilst the collection thus remains substantially the same as in the larger edition, a new feature has been introduced by placing in a separate section such of the prose articles as did not specially refer to the death of children, and several contributions not in the previous editions are to be found in this.

*Missionary Theology: Considered in its two doctrines of Endless Misery, and a Past Millennial Advent of Christ.* By Edward White, Minister of St. Paul's Chapel, Hawley Road, Kentish Town. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

THIS is a paper re-printed from the 'Rainbow,' and designed to make good the thesis, that when at the close of last century, with simplicity of purpose, heroic faith, and devoted piety, the Baptist, Independent, and Episcopal Missions were founded, there was scarcely a man among the whole company of persons engaged in these glorious undertakings who ever dreamed of doubting any of the doctrines stamped with the *imprimatur* of the sixteenth century Reformation; but that, now, the theological spirit has recovered its energy in the churches, attention has been devoted once more to biblical criticism and doctrine, and there is a certain separation between the missions of Protestantism and the deeper home convictions of religious Englishmen. This separation is supposed by the writer to be caused chiefly by a change in the popular Christian

belief as regards the eternal destination of the heathen. That all the millions who rejected the missionary's message, or who never heard of it, are doomed to endless misery, 'is what may be called the State creed of all the missionary societies. No one is considered at liberty to deny it in a missionary speech or sermon. It is the platform creed of Exeter-hall. The missionary students at the colleges are supposed to believe it. The directors are supposed to believe it. The missionaries abroad are supposed to believe it. No one who openly asserted it would be asked at a missionary assembly or to plead the cause of missions before the people. And yet, it is disbelieved in the churches throughout the length and breadth of the country. It is doubted and denied with varying degrees of confidence. But it is doubted and denied almost universally, and most of all by persons of accurate knowledge and spiritual intelligence.' Another reason for the decline of interest in missionary societies is to be found, Mr. White thinks, in the failure of spiritual results; and a third he finds in the refusal of the missionaries to preach what he calls the pre-millenial advent of Christ.

*What I have Written. A Letter, Explanatory and Defensive, to the Rev. Henry Constable, M.A., Prebendary of Cork, etc., Regarding the Future of the Human Race.* By Henry Dunn. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., Stationers' Hall Court.

'WHAT I have Written' is surely a rather untowardly title, as taking us back to Pilate just after he had permitted the crucifixion of the Lord. But neither Mr. Dunn nor, we hope, any one of his readers will be disposed to desire that any association of ideas, however slight, should be affirmed betwixt the writer of this pamphlet and Pontius Pilate of old. If any should, the most likely person to do so would perhaps be the Rev. Henry Constable, who, it seems, has assailed Mr. Dunn's theological position as regards man's destiny in the future world with some acrimony, and is replied to by Mr. Dunn in the pamphlet before us. What Mr. Dunn believes is, briefly, that Scripture does not teach the final impenitence of any who have not wilfully and deliberately rejected the truth calling them to it; and in this belief thousands

of minds, loving 'judgment and equity,' will certainly be disposed to acquiesce. But with this Mr. Dunn mingles other inferences, wherein, to our thinking, light is largely adulterated with shade. His pamphlet is written in a thoroughly Christian spirit, and is free, therefore, from the wretched bitterness and petty spite that too often sully the pages of disputants in theology.

*Prohibition Triumphant. A Short and Popular Explanation of the Permissive Bill, and Seventy-five Objections against it and Teetotalism Answered; Being a Reply to a Tract entitled 'A Blow at the Defenders of the Permissive Bill; or, Teetotalers as a Class Weighed in the Balance and found Wanting.'* By James Cavis. Blackburn: Barton and Hargreaves.

The title so fully explains the purpose of this pamphlet, as to make further description unnecessary. Mr. Cavis meets all the objections fairly and as fully as was requisite, and leaves his opponent no leg to stand on.

*Aunt Winnie's Tale.* By Miss Glazebrook. Authorress of 'The Lips that Touch Liquor Shall Never Touch Mine.' Bradford: William Draper. A very well told tale, having a 'moral' similar to the burden of the song credited in the title page to Miss Glazebrook's authorship.

*The Social and Legal Aspects of the Domestic Service Question.* Suggesting a New System of Hiring Servants, and an Amendment of the Laws Affecting the Relations of Employer and Employed. A Social Science Paper. By M. A. B. London: L. Booth, 307, Regent-street.

*The 'Man of Sin' Revealed in the Past and Awaiting his Doom in the Future:*

*or, the 'Apostacy,' the Degenerate Christian Church, and the Popes as the Head of the Anti-Christian System, the 'Man of Sin.' An Argument; in which the Objections of Romanist and Protestant Writers to the Application of Paul's Prophecy in 2 Thess. ii. 1-12, to the Papacy, are Examined.* By the Author of 'Short Arguments about the Millennium.' London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

*Topics for Teachers. A New Work for Ministers, Sunday-school Teachers, and others, on an entirely original plan.* By James Comper Gray, Halifax, author of 'The Class and the Desk.' Illustrated with over 200 Engravings and eight first-class Maps. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

*The Hive. A Storehouse of Material for Working Sunday-school Teachers.* London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

*Old Jonathan, The District and Parish Helper.* London: W. and H. Collingridge, 117 to 120, Aldersgate-street.

*The Life-Boat; or, Journal of the National Life-Boat Institution.* London: 14, John-street, Adelphi.

*The Scattered Nation.* Edited by C. Schwartz, D.D. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

*The Appeal. A Halfpenny Magazine for the People.* London: Elliot Stock.

*The Church. A Religious Penny Magazine.* London: Elliot Stock.

# Meliora.

---

## FIELD SPORTS.

1. *The Fortnightly Review*, October 1, 1869. Art. I. The Morality of Field Sports. By E. A. Freeman.
2. *Land and Water*, November 6, 1869.
3. *British Rural Sports*. By Stonehenge. Eighth Edition. London : F. Warne & Co. 1868.
4. *The Quarterly Review*. Vol. 103. Art. VI. Sense of Pain in Men and Animals.
5. *History of European Morals*. By W. E. Lecky, M.A. 2 Vols. Longmans & Co. 1869.
6. *Man and Nature*. By G. P. Marsh. London : Simpson, Son, & Co. 1864.

IT is impossible to discuss the relations of man to the animal world without being driven back to primæval times. Our present relations are the result of diverse agencies, acting and interacting, through long spaces of time. A settled life, pastoral, agricultural, or urban; special legislation, humanitarian or destructive; and science, leisure, and ethical cultivation, have all had their effect in determining our sympathies and enmities, our hostility and domestication. The extinction of species, their modification and redistribution, are mainly attributable to these various agents, working with or against climatic influences. Man is the head of a series, and as he moves, settles, and progresses, animals, plants, and vegetables are varied in their orders, nourished, changed, or destroyed. This is part of his 'dominion' as 'the paragon of animals,' the wielder of a godlike intelligence. The commencement of these subtle influences is coeval with the faintest tinge in the dawn of civilisation, and

cannot be traced distinctly in any nations save those which seem destined to be absorbed or destroyed by others. In those dim, far-off times we catch glimpses of a unity which speedily perishes to make way for a newer and gentler harmony, which will reach its highest expression when man has attained his loftiest elevation. The difference between the earlier and the later series of harmony will be understood if we compare the character of animal life in a wild and a settled country, say Africa and England. In the one case the dominion of man is uncertain; in the other it is easy and assured. There is a fierceness in the animal relations of undisturbed natural states that finds no parallel in civilised lands. With the direct and continuous intervention of man come a new order and a new spirit. He has to make war on his own account, and his warfare tends to soften the general animosities of animals, even though he may avail himself of natural antagonism in his warfare. When he begins to domesticate, he throws the shield of his protection over beings unable to protect themselves; he lives by the chase, but he comes into direct conflict with all animals of high organisation that do the same; and as he withdraws his energy from the woods and the plains he assumes a still newer relation to the animals that minister to his wants, and a wholly different kind of hostility to those that hinder his settled pursuits. He is first of all a hunter for subsistence, then for protection, and finally for pleasure or sport. The element of sport is present in the two previous stages, but subordinated to other ends.

We should be slurring over this part of the question did we not note the fact that with primitive man, so far as we can trace his feelings in history, names, religions, and precepts, there was cherished a closer kinship with animals than too frequently fails to show itself with civilised races. To begin with the evidences of the Old Testament, scattered and fragmentary as they are, and diversely as they may be interpreted. It was Adam who first named the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air; they shared the displeasure of God; they were saved, in families, with Noah; the firstborn of man and beast alike was sacred; it was not lawful to work either man or beast on the Sabbath; it was pronounced cruel to muzzle the ox when he trod out his master's corn, to yoke together an ass and a heifer, to seethe a kid in its mother's milk, to take the nursing bird with her young or her eggs; and the picture of the new kingdom of love and peace is drawn as one in which wolf and lamb, leopard and kid, shall have forgotten their animosities, and the calf, the young lion, and the little child shall dwell har-

moniously together. In the Institutes of Menu we detect hints of a similar recognised unity. The slaughter of beasts, except for sacrifice, is forbidden, kindness to animals is inculcated, and agricultural pursuits are condemned with a tenderness almost incomprehensible to us, 'for the iron-mouthed pieces of wood not only wound the earth, but the creatures dwelling in it.' We have less direct evidence of this in the earliest form of poetic and moral teaching. It is this community of nature between man, brute animals, and plants, says Mr. G. P. Marsh, which 'serves to explain why the apologue or fable, which ascribes the power of speech and the faculty of reason to birds, quadrupeds, insects, flowers, and trees, is one of the earliest forms of literary composition.' It is of Eastern origin, and it is worth inquiry whether the fable proper, as just described, preceded or succeeded the myth, or was found less or more amongst the non-mythological races. We cannot find that the double problem has attracted the attention of Professor Max Müller, who uses the word fable generically. There is a difference, however, between the fable and the myth. The first owes its origin to the fancy, and contains worldly wisdom; the second springs from the imagination, and deals with higher problems. The one appeals to the understanding, the other to the pure reason. One endows beings with speech and reason, the other turns abstractions into persons, and natural chemistries into living thoughts. We are also able to catch this quick sympathy in living, savage races, as the North American Indians, Australians, and others. Tribes are named after animals and plants, and the common belief is that each family has descended from the Totem, Kobong, or genius it worships.\* The North American Indian's Totem is familiarly known as medicine, and it descends to all the children a man may have. Thus the Beaver, in 'The Last of the Mohicans,' refused to pass a colony of beavers without addressing them, and called them his 'cousins.' Sir George Grey says, 'There is a mysterious connection between an Australian and his Kobong, be it animal or vegetable. . . . The family belief is that some one individual of the species is their dearest friend, whom to kill would be a great crime.' William the Conqueror signalled his English rule by making laws to protect the stag, the wild boar, and even hares. Various personal and political motives are assigned for these

\* See a curious collection of evidence on these points in 'The Worship of Animals and Plants,' by J. F. McLean, 'Fortnightly Review,' Art. IV., October 1, 1869. Sir George Grey says the Australians use the Totem as the family crest or ensign, and expresses the opinion that our heraldic bearings are traces of the Totem stage lingering in civilized nations.

laws, but a contemporary—Thomas Rudborne—gives a moral one: ‘This king loved wild beasts as though he had been their father.’ We cannot pursue this subject any further, but it was right to touch upon it in passing, as part of the question; and it may serve to show that all our boasted advancement is but an idle tale if we indulge in cruelty to the beings who fill up with man the kingdom of nature. We touch, indeed, something far nobler than a dim pantheism when we can say with Shelley’s Alastor:

‘—no bright bird, insect, or gentle beast  
I consciously have injured, but still loved  
And cherished these my kindred.’

It should be evident, we think, from the foregoing considerations, that we must vary the standard of man’s duty towards animals according to the nature of his habitat, his civilisation, and his common ethical notions. We cannot expect the savage to starve because the chase is inseparable from cruelty of some kind, or the civilised being to remain at peace with the objects which endanger his own life or the lives of his flocks and herds. Cruelty to animals, therefore, has one meaning in Africa and another in England, though it would be as brutal for a white man to torture unnecessarily in one country as the other. Where there are natural wilds and woods, animals of all kinds abound, and may be killed in virtue of man’s God-given dominion. As much pain may be inflicted, but it is justified by larger ends. The personal gratification of the slayer is only part of the question; the quiet pasturage or settled cultivation, or secure home life, or adequate food and physical comfort, are elements that come in and lift the act out of the range of ordinary cruelty or wantonness. Sport may be had, but it differs in kind from those home field sports which are artificial, kept up at great expense, the pleasures of a caste, or inseparable from torture. ‘As we refine,’ says Emerson, ‘our checks become finer.’ Our sport reflects our ethics. When a robust, warlike spirit is common, all amusements are cruel; captives are tortured; life is less sacred; humanity is fortified by valour, not chastened by tenderness. The sports of the amphitheatre, the bull ring, the bear garden, the cockpit, and the chase, will abound. When civilisation becomes luxurious and corrupt, cruelty accompanies the degradation, and ‘the choicest luxury of all’ will be ‘the spectacle of death and torture.’ When Christianity is an innovation, there will be martyrs for the wild beasts; when it becomes the State, there will be fires for the

heretics ; and when it passes into newer and higher regions, there will be communion with animals, evidenced in the lives of the Catholic saints, and a gentleness and consideration common to an industrial civilisation. Public morals influence private feeling. Cruelty to animals is the natural parent of cruelty to human beings. Montaigne remarks that after the Romans had become accustomed to the slaughter of beasts, they began to take delight in the slaughter of gladiators. Hogarth has pictured out this truth in his ‘Four stages of cruelty’—the lad who begins by torturing cats and dogs ending his career by a murder. But there are apparent exceptions to this unquestionable truth, which may deserve to be stated, though we reserve the explanation for the present. We quote Mr. Lecky’s convenient summary :—

“ To the somewhat hackneyed anecdote of Domitian gratifying his savage propensities by killing flies, we might oppose Spinoza, one of the purest, most gentle, most benevolent of mankind, of whom it is related that almost the only amusement of his life was putting flies in spider’s webs, and watching their struggles and their deaths. It has been observed that a very large proportion of the men who, during the French revolution, proved themselves most absolutely indifferent to human suffering, were deeply attached to animals. Fournier was devoted to a squirrel, Couthon to a spaniel, Panis to two gold pheasants, Chaumette to an aviary, Marat kept doves. Bacon has noticed that the Turks, who are a cruel people, are nevertheless conspicuous for their kindness to animals, and he mentions a Christian boy who was nearly stoned to death for gagging a long-billed fowl. In Egypt there are hospitals for superannuated cats, and the most loathsome insects are regarded with tenderness ; but human life is treated as if it were of no account, . . . . On the other hand, travellers are unanimous in declaring that in Spain an intense passion for the bull-fight is by no means incompatible with the most active benevolence and the most amiable disposition. . . . The very men who looked down with delight when the sand of the arena was reddened with human blood, made the theatre ring with applause when Terence, in his famous line, proclaimed the universal brotherhood of man. . . . Even in the amphitheatre there were certain traces of a milder spirit. Drusus, the people complained, took too visible a pleasure at the sight of blood ; Caligula was too curious in watching death ; Caracalla, when a boy, won enthusiastic plaudits by shedding tears at the execution of criminals. Among the most popular spectacles at Rome was rope-dancing, and then, as now, the cord being stretched at a great height above the ground, the apparent, and indeed real, danger added an evil zest to the performance. In the reign of Marcus Aurelius an accident had occurred, and the Emperor, with his usual sensitive humanity, ordered that no rope-dancer should perform without a net or mattress being spread out below. It is singularly curious that this precaution, which no Christian nation has adopted, continued in force during at least two hundred years of the worst period of the Roman empire, when the blood of captives was poured out like water in the Colosseum. The standard of humanity was low, but the sentiment was still manifest, though its displays were capricious and inconsistent.”

We may advance one or two other illustrations of this varying moral standard. The Neapolitans were not an extremely elevated people, yet they never encouraged, and do not seem to have enjoyed, the bull-fighting so common in Rome, the Romagna, and Spoleto. The Puritans suppressed bull and cock fighting, not as Macaulay antithetically puts it, speaking

of the former, ‘because it gave pain to the bull, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators.’ At the same time, they cruelly punished witches, and believed themselves to be doing God a service by their inhumanities. Sir Thomas More was the reverse of cruel or hard-hearted, and yet he was accustomed to boast of his skill in throwing the ‘cock-stele,’ or cock-stick. With the Restoration, bull baiting, cock fighting, and man fighting, when, as Sir Richard Steele remarks, the combatants cut ‘colllops of flesh’ from each other with their swords, were revived. Nor were they suppressed until, as Mr. Freeman notes, other movements had commenced ‘for the lessening of the hardness of our criminal law, and for the removal of the wrongs of the slave, the prisoner, and the lunatic.’

It is now our duty to consider why and in what respect our modern English field sports deserve to be condemned, and to reconcile the fact of their continuance with our growing humanity, as shown in special legislation in favour of domestic animals. The first part to be noted is that they are artificial, with the solitary exception of hunting the wild red deer and angling. We preserve in order to kill, and the enjoyment of a class, and not the feeding of the people, is the main end kept in view. Even vermin, like the fox, would soon be exterminated but for two things; the constant importation of them from France and Scotland, and the care taken to preserve them in the coverts and to brand as *vulpicide* any independent action of a tenant farmer. The artificiality of fox and stag hunting is seen in the preparatory training necessary to make a hunt worth anything. The young foxhound has to have his ears cropped to prevent them catching in the thorns, the dew-claws have frequently to be removed, and a small portion of the tail has to be cut off. To treat cats so would be cruel; to treat hounds so is scientific preparation for presumed scientific sport. ‘Hounds,’ says Stonehenge, ‘may be bought even at a month’s notice, horses may be soon got together, if a cheque is only written for their value (real or supposed), but foxes must be bred, if sport is to be obtained.’ Cubs must be obtained in the summer, fed until September or October, and then hunted ‘in order to prepare for future sport’ by preventing the foxes from getting too fat, and by ‘bleeding’ the hounds. ‘Without blood,’ remarks Stonehenge, ‘even the pack in regular work soon becomes slack, and the hounds hang back, instead of getting forward with the true foxhound dash.’ Annoyance increases the scent-giving properties of the fox, but it gets fainter and fainter during the run, which is not the case with the deer.

Thus the bagged fox can be best hunted by harriers, and it is sometimes necessary, in a sporting sense, to disappoint the foxhounds in order that they may be ‘savage for want of blood.’ (The italics are not ours.) Fox-hunting may thus rank as a science, inasmuch as foxes, hounds, horses, and men have to be trained for the sport. If extermination were resolved upon, the fox would soon be as extinct as the wolf or the wild boar. Their scarcity is even now a matter of complaint, and we may quote as a singular specimen of the selfishness this sport induces—a matter to be more fully considered further on—the opinion given in *Land and Water* of a Midland huntsman: ‘Leicestershire aint what it used to be, and never will, till you alter them game laws, and do away with them p’licemen as gamekeepers. Why, they take up a fellow with a hare or a partridge, and —— me, they let him shoot a fox under their noses! Make hares vermin, and foxes game, that’s my notion.’ And a very strange one, too, we may remark, since it would justify any outrageous laws for mere sport’s sake. There is similar training in hunting the carted deer. A number of them are turned into a high-fenced paddock, and ‘they are daily driven round at a moderate pace by men on horseback, or muzzled hounds, or sometimes by hounds trained like sheep-collies, to bark without biting. Without this training they would be wholly unable to stand ten minutes before the hound, but would be blown at once, because they are highly fed in order to get them into good condition, and would become internally fat if this food was allowed to be converted into that material so unsuited to produce good wind.’ No special training of this kind is necessary with the hare, but this animal is often trapped in order to give to the sport of hunting a foxy form, the trapped hare from its ignorance of a locality running straight instead of circular. In falconry, heronries have to be kept up or the sport is poor, commoner birds being uncertain and rather despised. A list of a score or more heronries existing in this country is given by Stonehenge, but he notes that the attempt to revive this old-fashioned sport in modern times by the use of pigeons for herons has failed. In training the hawk, the bird is hooded in order that ‘temporary blindness’ may tame his spirit. Most of our field sports here referred to are, as Professor Bain says, ‘the imitation by human beings of the exciting circumstances of the life of the wild beast.’\* To lead the life of a dog, Mr. G. H. Lewis reminds us in his exposition of cynicism, is ‘not the vocation of man.’ We may add that to imitate the wild beast

\* ‘The Emotions and the Will,’ p. 189. London: Parker and Son. 1859.

is not the highest vocation of a gentleman. Just see, for a moment, how we act. We transform a predatory instinct into an artificial pleasure, and call it a noble sport. Plato approved of hunting quadrupeds because it developed ‘godlike bravery,’ ending in ‘the victory of a soul fond of labour;’ but what bravery is there in fox hunting, stag hunting, or hare hunting? The hounds kill, except in the case of the stag, which is generally stuck after being partially worried, and the bravery is limited to taking fences, enduring hard labour, and risking a broken neck to merit a chronicle in the newspaper.

But artificiality alone would not condemn a sport. Cricket is artificial, golf is artificial, croquet is artificial, but none of them are cruel. They do not inflict suffering upon animals, but field sports do. We prefer to quote Stonehenge on this point because he is a sportsman, and writes for sportsmen. He is describing the fixing of fish on the hook as live bait, and declines to proceed to details of some methods which are ‘abominably cruel.’ He then goes on:—‘*All field sports are too much mixed up with an under current of cruelty; but, where there is a choice, no man of any ordinary feeling will hesitate in selecting the least severe modes of taking game.*’ But men do not make the choice. They hunt the fox because he is not game, but vermin, when they might rid the country of the race altogether, to the benefit of the community; and they hunt the hare and the stag, which are game, when they might be content with shooting the first and stalking the second. We are aware, of course, that we start a difficult discussion when we come to the question of the sense of pain in animals. The animal is indeed, as M. Michelet says, a ‘dark mystery! an immense world of musings and dumb sorrows.’ But we have some clue in the known qualities of nervous matter, whether found in men or animals, and the action of sensations on the brain. Animals with complex nervous systems have senses as keen as man, though not so long sustained or enveloped by moral feeling. They have understanding, but not reason; they have memory, but little imagination; they have natural antipathies, and endless fears. ‘We have no proof, rigorously speaking, that any animal feels,’ says Mr. G. H. Lewes; ‘none that any human being feels; we conclude that men feel, from certain external manifestations, which resemble our own, under feeling; and we conclude that animals feel on similar grounds.\* Though, therefore, it is not true to say the meanest insect ‘feels a pang as great as when a giant dies,’ it is erroneous to put down similar manifestations of pain in animals to quite

---

\* ‘Physiology of Common Life,’ vol. ii. p. 327. Blackwood. 1859.

another cause than that which is known to exist in man. In undisturbed natural states, animals do not seem to fear man as greatly as in those conditions under which man is constantly asserting his supremacy or his hostility. When the fox flies before the hounds, it knows it is flying for life, and flight develops all its cunning and ferocity. Its cry, or yelp, as surely indicates terror and anguish as the cry of a beaten hound. The full-grown fox cannot be tamed, and soon sickens and dies in confinement. It purrs or murmurs when pleased, and is a shy, cautious, reserved animal. The apologist for field sports in *Land and Water* remarks that, 'in a life of constant apprehension like that of the fox or hare, fear can hardly assume that agonising form it does in man, and perhaps in domestic animals, or life would be such an intolerable burden that they would have no appetite for their food or leisure to continue their species.' We grant the first assertion here, but deny the two inferences. If the fox or the hare were hunted all the year round, fear would have full play; but such is not the case. They enjoy a respite during the breeding season, and speedily forget past troubles. But they may feel present pain quite as acutely for all that. They may 'enjoy life' during the season of rest, but it is foolish to argue that 'such enjoyment may be set off against the suffering.' Were neither foxes nor hares hunted, what life they had until they were killed would be enjoyment, and death would be speedy. We add to the death by preceding cruelty. Perhaps the hare suffers more than the fox. It is shyer altogether, more sensitive, and less ferocious. It is silent during pursuit, but its occasional doubles, pausings, and acute listening, all betoken alarm and pain, though the latter is for the present passive. 'The kill is generally with harriers, the most painful part of the business,' observes Stonehenge, 'because, in the first place, the cries of the hare are often piteous and piercing in the extreme, resembling those of a child in agony; and the hounds not being always allowed to have her, the whip is obliged to be used at a time when they least deserve it.' It is unnecessary to add a word to this fatal admission; but we may just note that the same writer calls attention to the fact that fox hunting is becoming in some districts 'less popular than hare hunting,' owing to low rents, hard times, increase of railways, and arable land, though for his part he cares not which sport 'is triumphant, but one or the other ought certainly to be encouraged for the sake of that country's welfare.' The chase and death of the stag is no exception to any of these conclusions respecting the fox and the hare. He is a nobler animal, and fights with his pursuers

when finally brought to bay. In a late article on the subject of stag hunting in the 'Quarterly Review,' we were calmly told, says Mr. E. A. Freeman, the historian, whose article in the 'Fortnightly' will do immense good, coming, as it does, from a country magistrate, 'in language which savoured a little of the slaughter-house how the hounds were at certain times allowed to "go into" a hind—that is, I suppose, to tear them in pieces, in order to "blood" them. A man who set his dogs to tear a sheep in pieces would at once find his way before the magistrates, and few people would pity him if his sentence were as severe as the law allows. This subtle distinction between one ruminant and another is beyond me.' We do not hold it right to invoke the aid of poetic description in discussing a question of this kind, but there is so much truth in the first Duke's description of the sorrows of a chased stag, in 'As You Like It,' that we give a few lines, by way of a pendant, to what we have already written :—

The wretched animal heav'd forth such groans  
That their discharge did stretch his leathern coat  
Almost to bursting ; and the big round tears  
Coursed one another down his innocent nose  
In piteous chase ; and thus the hairy fool  
Much mark'd of the melancholy Jaques  
Stood on the extremest verge of the swift brook,  
Augmenting it with tears.'

A third ground upon which we contend that hunting is logically and morally indefensible is, that it does not materially differ in character, but only in degree, from the sports already condemned and deemed brutal by every one pretending to the designation of gentleman. Bull baiting was sport. The bull was tied to a stake, the hounds were set upon him, and the spectators sat in boxes looking on. It was 'a very rude and nasty pleasure,' says Pepys. Windham, the patron of 'sport' and defender of bull baiting said, 'No one who condemns bull baiting can consistently defend fox hunting ;' and Mr. Freeman makes that the text of his able and instructive essay. 'Strip fox hunting of its disguises, and its principle is, as Windham allowed, exactly the same as the principle of bull baiting. To be sure the bull is tied to a stake, while the fox is allowed to run for his life, and has a chance of escape. This, no doubt, makes the cruelty somewhat less revolting, but it does not make it cease to be cruelty. The spectators at a bull bait simply sit or stand and look on, while the fox hunter is an actor, he follows his victim on horseback, and enjoys healthful air and exercise in so doing. This is one of the disguises with which the cruelty is masked; a

disguise which no doubt leads many to join in a fox hunt who would not join in a bull bait, but which is simply a disguise, and which leaves the essential cruelty exactly where it was. A bull bait can be condemned only on the ground that our amusement ought not to take the form of inflicting wanton suffering on any creature. And on that principle a fox hunt must be condemned also.' Bear baiting did not materially differ from bull baiting, only that it was considered a more royal sport. Queen Elizabeth was fond of it, and Sir Walter Scott, in his *Kenilworth*, represents the Duke of Sussex as petitioning her against Shakespeare because his plays distracted the people from bear baiting. In James the First's favourite sport, cock fighting, two animals of the same species were fed for the purpose, and armed with steel spurs in order to make the wounds they inflicted on each others' heads more fatal. In hunting, we train and 'blood' hounds to prey upon animals of a different species, finding in their antagonism the ground of our enjoyment. But if we set a dog to worry a cat we are at once accused of inhumanity, and punished accordingly. The cat, like the stag, can defend itself, but the fox and the hare are comparatively helpless. In hunting the carted deer, however, we have Stonehenge's authority for saying that the animal is 'some time before deprived of his horns.' He is thus deprived of his defence, and his life is spared that he may be hunted again, until he becomes 'so used to the gallop as to show little fear of the hounds.' We are not aware that it has ever been contended there was an essential difference between condemned sports and those now in vogue. The apologist in *Land and Water* simply says that of all ground of argument the one by analogy is the 'most fallacious,' immediately passing to the remarks about a life of constant apprehension, already noticed. But he runs with the hare and holds with the hounds. He argues that constant apprehension diminishes pain, and then goes on to state that the fox has his seasons of enjoyment; so had the cock and the bull, enjoyment in all cases being intermediate repose and natural life. If we inflicted periodical suffering on a human being it would be absurd to plead in mitigation the enjoyment he felt between, and it is precisely so here. Pain is pain, whether it be constant or intermittent, and the vice of hunting is that the length of the run, or the prolongation of the animal's sufferings, is the measure of the amount of 'sport.' The cat would seem to be the only animal, or the home representative of a large foreign species, which wantonly prolongs the pains of its victims. As an old warrener once remarked to us, it kills for 'mere sport' when hunger is

satisfied. We have written ‘the only animal;’ we forgot the ‘paragon of animals—in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a God!’

There is the selfishness of a caste about hunting. Everything must bend to the sportsman. Pheasants must be disturbed in their coverts, and whoever dislikes to have his land hunted over, his fences broken, his fowls carried off by the fox, or dares to shoot the vermin that affords sport to others, is deemed a churl, a brute, a vulpicide. Fox hunting is costly. Stonehenge calculates that a pack of hounds for hunting three days a week will cost £845 per annum; for five or six days, £1,530; and that the annual outlay in the sport is, for all existing establishments and frequenters of the meets, £600,000—a pretty sum, our readers will think, for hunting vermin. Take its effect upon the persons engaged in it. Supposing that cruelty, because it is so disguised and fenced about, does not harden the heart, we must see the force of Mr. Freeman’s remark, that though every fox hunter may not be a bad man, yet, ‘*caeteris paribus*, the fox hunter would be a better man if he were not a fox hunter. A mere fox hunter, a mere bull baiter, a mere amateur of gladiators, can never have been an estimable character in any age.’ And yet how many of our country gentlemen grow so absorbed in the pursuit that it seems to ‘become like a religion or a political party—a sacred thing, to which all other persons and things must give way, and any interfering with which, by word or deed, is worse than murder or sacrilege.’ Consider its ethico-legal aspect. Cruelty to animals is punishable by the laws of the land. In country districts the administrator of law may be a fox, hare, or stag hunter. He fines urchins and grown men who play at his sport with dogs and cats, and the men may be driven into making comparisons if the youths do not. Mr. Freeman tells a story in which a father urged this plea in defence of his son. But the bench did not answer: it is in their power to command silence and be silent themselves. Hence the grumbling about one law for the rich and another for the poor, and the difficulty of making strong moral impressions where the need for them is not urgent. There is a Royal Society to prevent cruelty to domestic animals, and nobly it does its work,\* there are royal

\* This society was founded in June, 1824, and in 1840, by command of Her Majesty, was honoured with the prefix of ‘Royal.’ It has done immense good in three ways: First, by prosecution, in which it has enforced respect for the several laws to prevent cruelty to animals, as Martin’s Act, the 12 and 13 Vict., portions of 24 and 25 Vict., having reference to the killing or maiming cattle; the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill, which promises to suppress the traffic in glandered horses;

licences to inflict cruelty to animals under the name of sport, and the parallel of humanity in the one case is custom in the other.

'An ounce of custom outweighs a ton of reason,' said Hommel. It is certainly so in the case of field sports. We disguise their cruelty, and fashion does the rest. We look upon them as, perhaps, morally objectionable; but when they are not sports in which we indulge, we do not curiously inquire into them; and, when they are, we catch certain words—'noble,' 'glorious,' and the like—and they seem to drug our moral nature. It should not be so, but it is, and for the simple reason that it is mentally and morally easier to accept all the conditions under which we are born and live, than question them or rise superior to them. Pressed by argument to justify anything already existing, the apologist readily says, 'You must convince others as well as me. The sport is practised—humane men do not condemn it—the law sanctions it—what should we do without it? Why cannot you let it alone? Think of its effect on the breed of horses—how much good the money spent on a hunting establishment does the country, and its healthful action on ladies and gentlemen?' But all these are mere bare doubles, and evade the straight line of defence. Are such sports cruel, artificial, wasteful, ungentlemanly, and remnants of a barbarous age and a low state of ethical feeling? Reason presses for

---

and for an Act of George III., 1784, regulating knackers' yards, &c. Second, by procuring legislation, as, in 1835, the Amendment of Martin's Act; in 1839, the insertion of a clause in the new Metropolitan Police Act, by which the cruel and dangerous practice of using dogs to draw carts and other vehicles was prohibited within fifteen miles of London; in 1845, an amendment of the law relating to knackers' yards; in 1849, the improved Act for the Prevention of Cruelty cited above; and in 1854, an Act prohibiting the use of dogs as beasts of draught or burden throughout England, as well as an amplification of the term domestic animal, so as to include farm yard birds and swans. And third, by enlisting the sympathies of all persons in the noble work of gentleness and humanity through the press and the pulpit, and recently by a monthly publication known as 'The Animal World.' The society has obtained no less than 14,506 convictions, and justly rejoices that the Dog Act of 1854 has obtained a bloodless victory, not a solitary conviction having taken place under it. In Massachusetts a law has been passed protecting alike domestic animals and *feræ naturæ*; but in England, as Mr. Colam, the secretary of the society, informs us, the law protects a tame rabbit and pigeon without shielding a wild creature of the same species. Another anomaly is worthy of notice. Hunting the otter resolves itself into a fight, if hunting the fox does not; but it is lawful to worry an otter in a river, or on its banks, when it would be unlawful to hunt or fight it with a dog or dogs in 'any place,' that is, house or pit, into which persons were admitted for money. No animal, whether wild or domestic, can, by Act 12 or 13 Vic., sec. III., be legally baited or fought in such enclosure. It follows that to set hounds upon a stag would, in a small walled enclosure, say a town cricket or racing ground, be an infringement of the law; whereas it ceases to be so in a park, or where the hunters subscribe for expenses but do not pay for admission.

answer, custom twists us with hostility to the game laws, and with a desire to drive country gentlemen into the towns. Custom hides cruelty. When Pepys saw some cock fighting, he did not think it 'a nasty pleasure' like bull baiting. He was struck by the lively interest taken by the common people in the sport, and says of the fighting itself, 'it was no great sport, but only to consider how these creatures, without any provocation, do fight and kill one another.' The cruelty of the thing and its brutalising effect, he does not seem to have noticed. Lord Kames said the bear garden was held in abhorrence by the French and other polite nations; but a writer in the *Spectator* refers to the same place as one to which those 'who show nothing in the human species but risibility' may resort, and 'where reason and good manners have no right to disturb them.' Rabbit coursing is deemed by most persons to be a vulgar sport, as opposed to others practised by gentlemen, it being the delight of mechanics and townspeople. But, in speaking of it, Stonehenge is more logical than most gentlemen are. He says, 'It may be open to the charge of cruelty, but so is every sport depending upon the death of its victims for its existence.' Mr. Lecky enlightens us on the moral effect of custom, both as reflecting a prevailing standard and as exonerating the individual. A man who enjoyed a gladiatorial combat in ancient Rome was less inhuman than an Englishman would be who should take pleasure in it now. The one conforms to a common standard, and the other falls below it. As individuals, Mr. Lecky says we have 'a much greater power than is sometimes supposed of localising both our benevolent and malevolent feelings.' We insensibly make distinctions of time and place, and divide ourselves so that we may be kind and gentle with one species and rude and brutal with another without perceiving the contradiction. Aversions come into play. We fondle a pet dog, but kick a cat out of the room. We are as tender to canaries as Count Fosso, in the 'Woman in White,' but, like him, we may be as cruel to human beings. 'There are many,' said Mr. Lecky, with profound truth, 'who would accede without reluctance to a barbarous custom, but would be quite incapable of an equally barbarous act which custom had not consecrated.' Thus our ethical notions may be exalted, our customs low and grovelling. To bring the two into harmony is the duty of the moral reformer, and he must not and will not mind if he meets opprobrium in so doing.

A few words on shooting. . The chief moral objection is a love of slaughter, hidden under the name of sport. Several

kinds of game could only be procured for food in this way. The death of the animals is painless, and does not enter into the question at all as it does in hunting. The main thing to be considered is the sportsman. He enjoys the butchery with less or more of pursuit. He is, as Mr. Freeman says, 'an amateur butcher, a butcher who takes up the trade out of pure love of slaughter. One can hardly fancy a man going out by preference to kill his own sheep or his own poultry; what conceivable difference does it make if the animals slaughtered be deer or pheasant?' Morally none; but special laws have made slaughter of this kind the privilege of a class, and it is thus ranked as gentlemanly amusement without question or thought. Sir Walter Scott was not a mawkish sentimentalist, but he once told Basil Hall in conversation that when he had knocked down his black cock, 'and going to pick him up, he cast back his dying eyes with a look of reproach,' he was quite touched. 'I don't affect to be more squeamish than my neighbours, but I am not ashamed to say that use never reconciled me fully to the cruelty of the affair. I don't carry this nicety, however, beyond my own person.' Modern battues are pronounced by most thoughtful persons to be sickening affairs. Coverts are beaten, the game is driven to the sportsman, attendants load and carry the game, and the sport consists in knocking over the largest possible number. Turnip shooting is similar to the battue in principle; the birds having been forcibly driven to one place. Stonehenge says this is 'more worthy of the butcher than the true sportsman. It is, in fact, the same spirit which leads to the use of the bagged fox or the trapped hare, though not perhaps quite so bad as those unmitigated Cockney tricks. It appears to my unlimited judgment that pigeon trap shooting is quite as good sport as this turnip butchery, and it may be had much more early and at less expense; but, as Colonel Hutchinson says, every Englishman must have his prejudices, and whether this of mine is founded in truth or not, it is scarcely for me to say.' We may, however, congratulate the writer on having hit the truth. Morally, we see no difference between the two, except that it is said, though on doubtful authority, that the pigeons are artificially blinded in one eye to produce a uniform direction in their flight. These pigeon matches are, in truth, an abomination, and the condemnation pronounced upon them by persons who do not equally condemn other sports, is but another illustration of the effect of custom, though it leads us to hope that reasoning by analogy may ultimately have its effect. Until lately, pigeon shooting has

been deemed a low, vulgar pleasure. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, and other able organs, constantly in the hands of educated persons, have commenced a brisk warfare against it, and it must soon cease to be a permissible sport for a refined, intelligent nature.

There is hope for a new crusade against inhuman field sports. Mr. Freeman's example will have a healthful effect, and the discussion he has had the courage to evoke must leave its mark. Mr. Lecky, though less directly, is a warrior on the same side, and Mr. Marsh has done something by a wonderful book, not studied half so much as it deserves, to make us familiar with natural harmonies, primitive and modern, the order man disturbs, and the new order he should create, in which ferocity should be restrained, and he should truly make himself lord of all, and not the copyist or the torturer. A gentler humanity, far removed alike from pantheism and sentimentalism, is growing amongst us. We cannot longer endure the taunt Mr. Henry Taylor has so admirably expressed—

‘Pain, terror, mortal agonies, that scare  
The heart in man to brutes thou wilt not spare.  
Are theirs less sad and real? Pain in man  
Bears the high mission of the flail and fan,  
In brutes ‘tis purely piteous. God’s command,  
Submitting his mute creatures to our hand  
For life and death, thou shalt not dare to plead;  
He bade thee kill them, not for sport but need.’

The newspaper and periodical press is a great engine of influence on the right side, much as class organs may apologise, and must of necessity do so to exist, for sports sanctioned by law or custom. The daily press does for the public at large what gossip does for individuals—‘it keeps even the angels in their proprieties.’ A new conquest of nature dawns on us, as it does with every influx of light, intellectual or moral. When Catholicism would express its belief in a realised blessedness, it pictures its saints as recovering the influence exercised by Adam in Eden. The kinship of man and animals, indeed, owes much to these legends, for they have caught a glimpse of the true ideal of his relationship—the subjection of the animal, and therefore its permissible death—the superiority of the man, and therefore his abstention from torture. ‘The beasts of the field and the fowls of the air,’ says St. Jerome, ‘are included in the primordial covenant of love—and whenever slaughter becomes sport, the sport verges upon injustice, and rushes from injustice to the worst hardening of the heart.’

---

## MODERN TOWN CONVEYANCES.

OUR forefathers found this world a very bad one to move about in. The stubborn materiality of things was sadly too much for their limited ingenuity. Distance was a most solid fact to them ; and the annihilation of time and space, whether 'to make two lovers happy,' or for any other purpose, was with them a mere fancy, having its only fitting place in a joke. The art of setting vehicles on wheels, though very old, was indeed yet in its infancy. It has thriven well since then, and now is possibly near its maturity. The still more difficult art of setting wheels on roads, to which is ancillary the great art of roadmaking, was still less advanced when the current century opened ; what great advances have been made in it since then we all know pretty well. The human race, in this country at least, was a baby at roadmaking little more than half a century ago ; it has cut its eye teeth since then, and even its wisdom teeth are now on the road. Macadam—illustrious name—has won for itself a renown second only to the yet mightier name of Stephenson. Yet the Romans had made excellent roads, some of which still remain as examples of how a lasting, though not a cheap, pavement may be constructed ; and in towns and cities the art of paving had not died out, though its extension into the great highroads of the country was unpracticable because too dear, prior to the useful invention of Macadam. The Romans were not the only good roadmakers in old times. Prescott's 'Conquest of Peru' presents a brilliant picture of the immense talent as road-constructors which the Incas displayed :—'Over pathless sierras covered with snow, galleries were cut for leagues through the living rocks ; rivers were crossed by means of bridges that swung suspended in the air ; precipices were scaled by stairways hewn out of the native bed, and ravines of abysmal depth filled by solid masonry.'

In the absence of vehicles deserving the name, and of roads worthy of such vehicles, people in our own country prior to the last century or so, could but, of course, stop at home 'with might and main.' And they did so. Only utmost necessity made the mass of them personally acquainted with anything above a few miles distant from the villages or towns they lived in ; and such utmost necessity happened only to a few. There were legs in those days, of course, and most people used them ; and to all the more purpose because they were the only resource available to most people. The popular

'calf' was firmer and better developed than it is now in towns, where omnibuses and cabs have taken much of the strain off the muscles of the lower extremities. In cases of absolute need there were stage wagons and carriers' carts at two statute miles per hour, available for folk unpossessed of horseflesh and private conveyances. For the gentry, then largely resident in towns, there was that narrowest but easiest of vehicles, the sedan chair. Any one whose age entitles him to remember the early years of the century, will be able to recall the frequent spectacle of two humble but useful men, bearing at a light springy speed of three miles or so per hour under favourable circumstances, the quaint band-box with windows in which sat the gentleman in silk stockings and buckled shoes and perhaps a queue, or the lady in whatever happened to be the feminine costume of the period. Setting-down-time was the standing treat of the idle boys and girls of the streets; for then, the sedan chair having been gently lowered upon its base, and the chairmen having relinquished their hold of the long poles they had been walking between, one of them lifted up the roof of the chair like a box lid, and opening one side of the vehicle, let out the highly respectable personage who had been caged in the interior. In taking up, again, this process was reversed; then, all being ready, the chairmen resumed their places between the shafts, one in front and one behind, and, lifting the chair up gently, with measured and equal steps gradually diminished till lost to sight in the perspective, or suddenly vanished round the next corner. Although it is some years since we saw him, we are not quite satisfied that the sedan-chairman is even yet entirely extinct. He may yet linger in or near the close of some small cathedral city—like the specimen whom, only a few years back, we detected at Hereford or Gloucester.

For the public at large, the first important advance upon previous modes of locomotion was made by Macadam and the coach—the flying coach, as its proprietary fondly entitled it, on the strength of its wonderful speed of ten or possibly twelve miles per hour. This appeared to the last generation but one as the very *ne plus ultra* of locomotive improvement. At the close of the sixteenth century York had been at a whole week's distance from London. In 1734 the Newcastle flying coach consumed nine days in its journey to the metropolis—a longer time than is absolutely requisite now for a voyage to America. Before the coach, the only resources for the public at large had been the hired horse, or horse and gig, or for the wealthy the post chaise, with its profuse expenditure for postilions, toll-bars, innkeepers, ostlers, and horses, and for wheelwrights,

too, rendered necessary by universally rutty roads. From Penzance to Inverness the coaching system became prevalent, and Great Britain was proud of it, for it set an example of unexpected systematic fastness and punctuality. For post-office purposes it made Britain the envy of the world. It is true, couriers had been established from of old for kings, governments, and rich nobles ; and the horse mails had run as fast as rough or quagmirey roads would let them ; but great delays in postal transmission were inevitable. And for personal transit, what were horses or postchaises to the public at large ? They were available, as *nisi prius* or chancery was available, only for those who could afford such costly luxuries. The coaches at length brought those middle-class denizens of different towns who were not owners of horseflesh, into possibility of frequent acquaintance with each other. Now for the first time tradesmen in numbers in the provinces made their regular annual trip to the metropolis, or to the wholesale sources of their trades. If they signed their wills before starting, that was the more reasonable because of the stories of highwaymen still rife by the blazing fires of safe hostelries. If they had to sit all night through—and that probably a wet night, and whilst yet Mackintosh had not been born—and if nodding in weary sleep they almost or quite fell off the wire-bordered knife-board provided for their seat ; that was yet the best possible state of things, and far superior to any previous circumstances of long travel. We can still see in our mind's eye the look of vexed regret on the face of a poor commercial traveller known to ourselves when we were a boy, in reciting, on his return from town, how a brand-new beaver hat in the height of fashion bought in London in days when silk plush was unknown, and when hats were of real castor and cost from one to two guineas each, had become 'lost to sight, to memory dear,' at some vague and unconscious hour of the night whilst the head wearing it on the coach-top must have been nodding.

From the years 1819 to 1836, or still later, rivalry between coaching firms on several of the leading thoroughfares in the kingdom had become a perfect mania. So far was it carried, indeed, that proprietors sometimes ran themselves into the Bankruptcy Courts whilst running coaches for the public. This rivalry continued long after the year 1813, when Geordie Stevenson's ponderous and slow locomotive was surprising and amusing a limited public in the North of England. Prior to 1828, on the Darlington railway, the first train that carried passenger traffic by steam power had shown the way to the enterprising men of Liverpool and Manchester, whom the Duke of Bridgewater and Brindley had united by canal, but

whose increasing cotton traffic demanded much more extensive and more rapid means of conveyance than the shrewd Duke and his clever engineer could give them. The Liverpool and Manchester line was not the first railway that carried passengers by steam, but it was the first to be built with that object in view. Its success made it, to the world at large, the great mother of all the passenger railways ; the first of the lines that have since stretched themselves all over the solid earth wherever civilization has ventured to claim its settled right of way. To the coaching world, the railway project seemed at first to be the height of ridiculous madness ; but by and bye it led them to the depth of bankruptcy despair. At first, it was said, the iron horse could never make head against the flesh and blood animal ; but soon the cry was reversed, and the almost utter extinction of horseflesh was apprehended. Both predictions were mistakes. There were thirty-six coaches plying daily between Manchester and Liverpool before the railway was opened ; and the last of these was soon run quite off the road through the superior speed, comfort, safety, and economy of railway travelling. In a few years the parallel iron lines had become extended from Manchester to all sides of the kingdom, and, saving the canals, had largely superseded almost all the other means of systematized and regular transit for men and things. The great Hargreaves was only one of the owners of well-appointed wagons carrying merchandise to all parts of the kingdom, who had to sell up their establishments and leave the old highways to comparative solitude and grass. Inns, posting-houses, and carriers' quarters, which had abounded in all the leading roads in the country, became deserted of custom, and ultimately closed. The 'Great North Road,' the names of whose hotels were at least as well known to the public as were those of the signs of the zodiac, passed by degrees out of the acquaintance and ceased to occupy the mouths of travellers. A similar blight fell on the animation and prosperity of all the great roads in the kingdom. Leaming Lane in Yorkshire, for example, a portion of the great highway stretching from London to Inverness—once busy with pedestrians, with carriers' wagons having belled leaders and mounted drivers, with stage coaches, with gentlemen's carriages and outriders, with travellers on horseback, and with droves of cattle from the north accompanied by kilted and plaided attendants, is now, as to those its quondam glories, a hopeless thing of the past. The inns that lined it have ceased to offer to entertain the traveller, and in many places the once well-worn ground has covered itself undisturbed with nature's soft green carpet.

So much for the shortness of their foresight who had predicted for the great coaching interest a lasting triumph over the new-fangled invention of the engineer. And no more reliable was the power of prophecy in those who afterwards with alarm, saw, as they thought, the advent of a power fated to reduce to an almost worthless plethora of supply, the oats and hay which no horses' mouths were to be left to consume. The horse-breeder took heart again when he found that the railway system created a demand for subsidiary feeders, requiring a vast increase in the use of live horse-power. In proportion as the railways lengthened, the demand for horses augmented and strengthened. The iron ways created new branches of reproductive industry, and immensely enlarged the whole business of the country; calling into existence, withal, a passenger traffic such as had never existed anywhere in the history of mankind. To ride upon the railways became a pleasure to thousands, a necessity to hundreds and thousands of thousands; and to convey people to the railways a new system of town travelling was required. Prior to the railroad era, neither in the metropolitan nor in the largest provincial towns were there many public conveyances except such as were to be specially hired for each journey from the licensed coach proprietors; and as this kind of travelling was inconvenient, unready, and expensive, only the few availed themselves of it. The old hackney coaches, or 'flys,' of London, had begun to be pressed very hard about the year 1830 by two-wheeled 'cabriolets' of somewhat box-like construction, opening behind, and having a double seat on each side, and a 'box' for the driver in front. These, after having subserved the requirements of the public for some years, were in their turn thrown into the shade by Hansom's patent safety cab, which was brought out in 1837, and still holds its ground in all the principal towns for the lighter and swifter share of the traffic. The short and sharp work with many of the coaches effected by the fiery locomotive, was very different from the slow effect produced on the old lumbering hackney coaches of London. In defiance of lighter vehicles and lower fares, these antiquated machines, with their still more antiquated drivers, were only withdrawn from public service by slow degrees, disappearing one by one, and not quite vanishing till there ceased to be a single enemy to modern improvement found willing to patronize them. The Hansom cabs in London now appear to be largely in the majority over the other coaches and cabs. Since, at a recent date, the total number of both sorts was five thousand eight hundred, it is evident that the cab business in the metropolis, both as regards its service to the public, its

value to the proprietors, and its use to a large body of their servants, is an institution of no small importance; and a similar development of a cabbing business that was but in its infancy before railways were opened, has occurred in all the provincial towns.

Whilst the new cabs did much to supply the requirements of town travelling, the great public that needed to ride, but could not afford to pay much for its accommodation, required a still more economical method of locomotion in towns. The opening of railway stations soon compelled coach masters and hotel keepers to run omnibuses to meet the trains; but only by slow degrees did they awaken to a sense of how the public demand for vehicles would be taught to develope itself so soon as there should be visible a public supply. The year 1829 had witnessed the first appearance of the omnibus,—a new light sort of coach, with accommodation for more passengers in its interior than the old road coach had afforded, but not at first, with all the increased development of external carrying power, afterwards obtained by the introduction and utilization of the 'knife-board' on the top. Previously to this epoch passengers, as in the old coaches, had always sat facing either the front or the back. There was no happy medium between directly fronting either the prospect or the retrospect. Now, the retrospective seat, often so 'sea-sickening' to bad travellers, happily is abolished; and the customer either sits, like the driver, in the front, or takes a side-view of the shops and houses as he occupies his thrifty modicum of space on the knife-board. During the last forty years, the attention and energies of men of capital have been largely thrown into the omnibus service; and the modern vehicle, in every way a great improvement on the primitive omnibus, though less so in London than in many other towns, gives occupation to immense stables of horses prodigiously exceeding in numbers those at which, in the second generation backwards, our predecessors lifted up the eyebrows of their astonished admiration.

Messrs. Mitchell and Menzies, of Glasgow, have the credit of converting the more primitive omnibus into a really commodious convenience, with room up its centre for the conductor to walk without bruising the knees of passengers, and unencumbered with the stupid door boxing up the old vehicles. The new omnibus is drawn, not as of yore, by two wheelers and a leader guided by great and needless developments of rein-ribbons passing through brass hoops affixed to hard hide-wounding saddles, but now with three horses that work fairly abreast, and have no belly-bands, tail-straps, or

other unnecessary harness. Fourpence outside and sixpence in, for even the shortest distances, was still the most lenient charge of the omnibus driver, until Mr. Frame, a gentleman connected with the newspaper press of Glasgow, commenced, January the first, 1845, to run an omnibus between Bridgeton and Anderston (two opposite suburbs of Glasgow), at two-pence for the whole two-mile distance, or any part of it. Mr. Frame's scheme was found to be both a profitable speculation and a great public benefit; and, although Mr. Frame, at the end of a couple of years, overtaken by misfortune, was compelled to retire, men of capital followed up the scheme, and the Glasgow omnibus with its cheap fare found great development in all the large cities and towns in the provinces. In Liverpool, even a penny fare was adopted for a while. Ultimately the charge, as it did in Manchester, became fixed at twopence outside and threepence in. The introduction of the improved omnibus system into Manchester was made by a Scotchman named Macewen, about the year 1852. In 1861, in view of the International Exhibition traffic, Mr. Greenwood, of Manchester, sent up a large number of the new omnibuses to the metropolis, to compete with the old-fashioned small boxes that still contented the Londoners, but this effort failed to revolutionise the London omnibus system. The immense traffic of the leading thoroughfares of the metropolis, the narrowness of the streets, and the treacherous character of the pavements, proved too much for the new vehicle with its lightly-harnessed horses. The streets are not only being subjected to immense grind and wear, with consequent ruts and uneven edges, but they have a specially hateful repute for all kinds of drags and their horses. In frosty weather the face of the pavement becomes smooth as polished steel and slippery as oiled glass; and in the summer season, particularly when the stones are denuded of dust by the winds, it is difficult for horses used to the ground and displaying the greatest caution, to keep upon their legs. There is yet another condition of the London pavement that is little less dangerous to horses, and is supposed to be peculiar to the great metropolis:—when the stones are only partially wetted, they seem to be covered with a greasy slime, over which the poor frightened horses will frequently slip and slide the length, it may be, of their own bodies. When a new horse is brought to do duty, either in a cab or an omnibus, in London, if he is not very carefully managed, he is very likely to lose all courage and become useless, and even to die 'broken-hearted' during his apprenticeship. In fact, many cab horses are ruined in the first week of their metropolitan probation.

The streets of London, besides being the most perilous for animals and human beings, are most disgracefully dirty in wet weather; and their mud has cohesive quality almost equal to that of birdlime. We well remember our astonishment when we first went to the metropolis. The mud on the trowser we expected, as usual, to rub off as soon as dry, with a few slight scrapes of the nail and touches of the brush; and the expense of labour and loss of time that proved to be required to get rid of it, were both astonishing and disgusting.

At the present time there are over nine hundred omnibuses in London, five hundred of which are the property of the General Omnibus Company; the rest belong to various proprietors. Nearly all these conveyances ply from two centres—Charing Cross and the Bank—save outside part of the city and its wide-spreading suburbs. Some notion may be formed of the number of human beings continually on the move in the metropolis, when it is stated that the General Omnibus Company alone, in the two half-years ending respectively in December, 1867 and 1868, conveyed forty-one million four hundred and eleven thousand four hundred and eighty passengers. Great as this number is, it does not show the total personal traffic; it must be very largely added to by the travellers in cabs, leaving out of the reckoning the immense numbers carried by the metropolitan railway, the steamboats on the river, and the railways branching off on all sides to the suburbs. During six months ending in December of 1868, the distance traversed by the General Omnibus Company's vehicles, when reduced to measurement, proved to be six million one hundred and eleven thousand six hundred and thirty miles.

So recently as the year 1847 there was not a single two-wheeled cab in Glasgow, then as now the first commercial city of Scotland. So much was the want of lighter conveyances felt, that the town council actually offered a premium of two hundred pounds to any person who would undertake to supply the city with a few two-wheelers, and the prize was never claimed. It was not long, however, before the want of cabs in Glasgow was supplied by the enterprize of citizens, and at the present time her facilities for local travelling place Glasgow about on a level with any city in the empire. Three hundred and sixty-five cabs and one hundred and thirteen omnibuses now prove the highly stimulative effect of the railway system in that city, which had not a single street cab of its own at a period dating back little more than thirty years. To people who are unacquainted with the relative proportions of Edinburgh and Glasgow, it may seem unaccountable that there

should have been recently eighty-five more cabs in the former than in the latter. The disparity in the relative numbers of omnibuses in favour of Glasgow will give a truer notion of the business habits of the respective peoples. Glasgow has omnibus routes in all directions, but in Edinburgh there is comparatively very little travelling by this more popular class of vehicle. A recent return states the number of cabs in Edinburgh at four hundred and fifty, and of omnibuses at thirty-five. There were at the same recent date ninety-nine cabs in Leeds and twenty-five omnibuses. In Birmingham there were four hundred and two cabs and only twenty omnibuses. In Bristol there were one hundred and seventy cabs and forty-three omnibuses, but fully one-half of the latter are kept for special purposes. In the number of conveyances for town travelling, Liverpool stood next to London, having eight hundred cabs and one hundred and thirty-three omnibuses. In 1843 she had two hundred and seventy-eight hackney coaches. Within the memory of living men, Liverpool was haunted by pressgangs, and a few sailing ferry-boats met all the requirements of her people for passing to and from the Cheshire side of the Mersey. The large amount of business done in Manchester would lead to the supposition that the requirements for street conveyances of that city would be little short of those for the town of Liverpool; such, however, is not the case, as her cabs by late returns numbered three hundred and eighty, and her omnibuses one hundred and twenty-nine. Prior to 1828, persons now living knew Manchester when Market-street, her central thoroughfare, was a narrow lane walled in on either side by wooden-framed houses with protuberant upper stories, quaint gables, mullioned windows, and small diamond-shaped panes. Such persons still remember that at that time almost every man in the town in any respectable way of business kept his own town conveyance, and, unless when going a journey at a distance from the town, never used any other. Between sixty and seventy years ago there were numbers of old people in Lancashire who had never seen anything more like a coach than a rude country cart; and there were not a few of the hill-folks who had never tasted wheaten bread in their lives. In the seven cities and towns we have mentioned, exclusive of London, there are two thousand six hundred and thirty-six cabs and four hundred and fifty-two omnibuses. When it is considered that less than sixty years ago there were not three towns out of London in which a hackney coach openly plied for hire, an unmistakable proof is afforded of the great change that has been effected in the locomotive aptitudes and facilities of the people. In London, in one year, the recorded receipts from

the omnibus traffic alone of the General Omnibus Company amounted to five hundred and seventy-four thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight pounds, fifteen shillings, and nine-pence.

Both in London and in the provinces the street conveyances are under the immediate control of the civic authorities. Generally speaking the licences of drivers are granted, as in the metropolis, by the police authorities; and in Liverpool the cabs and omnibuses are under the supervision of the Watch Committee of the Town Council. In Edinburgh the licences are granted in the City Chamber by the Depute Clerk. In some of the large towns an officer is appointed under the title of Cab-inspector, whose duty it is to see that these vehicles are in a fit working condition, both as to cleanliness and safety. The local authorities impose a number of regulations on the drivers, intended to prevent them from overcharging or otherwise ill-treating their customers, or from appropriating their lost property. The travelling public and the cab proprietors have often needed mediation of this kind, the one insisting on low prices, the other determining to keep up a high rate of charge. A moderate by-law rate has always been found most profitable. In London many have been the hard fights between the public and the cabmen, and on the whole the result has been little better than a drawn battle. As a rule, it is not to be doubted but that the cab business has been a paying one, but to make it so requires good management, including all the care and economy the proprietors can bring to bear. Extraordinary is the wear, tear, and damage undergone by vehicles and horses when on duty in the streets of London. The cab masters have been hardly dealt with till now, having been made to pay an annual tax of from eighteen to twenty pounds per cab—a most objectionable form of impost. Should they hereafter combine to erect a statue in London, their hero will undoubtedly be the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has won for himself a great name amongst cab proprietors by releasing them in his budget of last session from this oppressive tax. The relief will be great not only to the master but also indirectly to the drivers, and will tend to the better service of the public at large. On February the 1st an entire change in the cab system will be effected under the new Act on hackney carriages, which will then come into force. There will in the metropolis be complete free trade in cabs and carriages for hire. Each carriage is to have painted on its doors the fares at which the owner will convey passengers. It is anticipated that better cabs will be introduced to the notice of the public.

The Biographies of Cabmen, were they adequately written, would often be deeply interesting, and not seldom truly pathetic. Perhaps, apart from the gold diggings of Australia and California, no so heterogeneous a body of working men can be found anywhere in the world as is constituted by the London cabmen. All social grades are represented amongst them, from broken-down aristocrats to exalted crossing sweepers. A cabman was pointed out to us a few months ago who had been a landed gentleman worth his thousand pounds a year only a short time before. Another had once a good business of his own as a carver and gilder. Others whom we have known have fallen victims to their own folly, the drinking customs, and the arts of the liquor traffickers ; others have been thrust down from superior social positions by sheer misfortune, and have not touched the bottom in the quagmire of poverty, until the ' dickey ' of the cab received them.

The life of a cab driver in London is one of continual danger and hardship. He is necessarily out in all kinds of seasons, and is exposed to a variety of temptations from which it is very difficult for him to escape. The worse the weather, the more certain is he to be out in it ; for it is when the general public are deserting the streets to find shelter from storms of rain, snow, or hail, or to secure shade in the sultry and roasting sunshine, that the cabman's services are most indispensable. For him or his horse no human being has any consideration ; whether the animal is exhausted with a day's hard toil, no one who wants a cab takes the trouble to inquire ; nor does any ' fare ' think it unfair that the man who drives the animal should be kept away for any stretch of time from his dinner or his bed. To balance this external disadvantage, the cabman has to struggle internally with an ever-recurring topological problem. How to get from this place to that by the shortest route ; how to discover exactly where that place is, even, is often a practical puzzle to the cabman whose memory for streets and routes is not extraordinarily roomy and tenacious. In provincial towns the leading roads are few, and the whole topography is a science quite susceptible of being mastered. Not so with the never perfectly knowable map of the great metropolis. And yet a driver must be somewhat familiar with the large city, its outlying territories, and ever-changing and growing suburbs, before he can be at all efficient in his vocation. Many drivers, it is true, accustomed to ply in some one neighbourhood, often know little that lies beyond, and when required to travel out of their familiar bounds, are as much at a loss as the most veritable greenhorn from the country. Then again, the streets of the most populous provincial town are scarcely

ever inconveniently crowded; but miles upon miles of the leading routes in the metropolis are ceaselessly thronged with vehicles of all kinds, amongst which the cabman has to thread his perilous way. As many as fifteen hundred journeys are performed daily over one single thoroughfare by omnibuses alone; and thousand of journeys are run by cabs, wagons, lourries, carts, private carriages, business vans, costermonger traps, and hand trucks, all of which are continually travelling about in mutually retarding streams. Here, a confluence of divers rivers of wheeled traffic meets and creates a too durable stagnation; there, the whole movement of vehicles and foot passengers densely crowding a street is brought to a dead lock by the collision or break-down of some machine on wheels, the fall and crushing to death of some pedestrian, or the last dying testimony and kicking remonstrance against its fate of some poor over-worked animal. Accidents like these are of frequent occurrence, and every one of them adds largely to the difficulty of the cabman, whose skill has at all times a hard fight of it, to keep his own vehicle from running over others, or being run over. To men new in the business, whose skill is undeveloped, the difficulty is immense, and the wear and tear of temper is most lamentable.

Of the temptations to which cabmen are exposed there is, as we have said, a copious variety. Valuable articles are accidentally dropped or thoughtlessly left in cabs by passengers, and become very trying to the honesty of the drivers who discover them. Occasionally customers are so-called gentlemen who have left their wits in taverns, and are unable to take care either of their money or of themselves. Very often the 'fare' is, or appears to be, not quite aware of the proper fare to pay, and it is more or less difficult for the cabman to forego the opportunity of imposing or trying to impose on such tempting innocence. Then there are the frequent chances of giving the wrong change in moments of hurry or in circumstances of darkness; of returning no change at all, where the passenger's wits are obviously gone wool-gathering; or of becoming partners in adventures with prostitutes and thieves. Whatever individuals may be guilty of, it would be unfair to accuse of such misconduct the whole body of cab-drivers. To assist them in the course of rectitude many of them prefer, there is a wholesome fear of magisterial visitations of fines, imprisonments, and suspensions or withdrawals of licence. On the whole, the life of a cabman in London is not a very enviable one, and, considering all things, it is not a little creditable to the men that so many of them are well conducted and respectable. To add to his difficulties, too often it must be remem-

bered that the driver is ‘treated’ by thoughtless passengers, and thus acquires or augments drinking habits to the last degree inimical to his welfare. This danger is increased by the fact that as his whereabouts during the day is necessarily uncertain, his arrangements for meals are incomplete, and the public tap is always ready to supply him with something to narcotise and deaden the feeling of hunger when it arises, or to gratify his natural or artificial thirst. In a body of eight thousand men—for such is the numerical total of the London cabmen—there will be, of course, some who make no difficulty in committing all sorts of disreputable actions; but considering their hardships, liabilities, and allurements, their conduct on the whole will compare favourably with that of almost any other equally large class of working men in the kingdom.

Two conditions are requisite for the obtaining of a cab-driver’s licence in London. In the first place, the applicant must procure the testimony of two respectable householders to his good moral character; and, in the second, he must pass an examination to prove his sufficient acquaintance with the various routes in the city and suburbs. On his obtaining employment, the driver’s name and the date of his engagement are entered in his license by his employer; and when he relinquishes the vocation, his licence paper is made to show on the face of it the cause of such relinquishment. A man who is not somewhat careful alike of his master’s property and of his own character, will soon have no property to be in charge of, and no character to be of the slightest service to himself. A large infusion of uncertainty causes the cabman’s work to be of a speculative character, as it is impossible to foresee whether he will or will not on any given day find full employment for the horses and cab. If the latter has two wheels, with which a pair of horses divide the day between them, he is expected to pay the proprietor from fourteen to sixteen shillings, and on special days may have to produce as many as twenty shillings. What he earns above the sum thus required by the owner, constitutes the whole of the wages on which he has to live; and if, as sometimes occurs, he has not received a single fare, he must yet pay the owner just the same sum as though he had been fully employed all day. The four-wheeled cabs generally rate at two shillings a day less than the Hansoms; the night cabs, which may be considered to be the last refuges for stiff-limbed horses and aged or otherwise semi-disqualified men, are charged from five shillings to eight shillings per night. The night work is especially trying, exposing men and horses to much suffering and privation; and it is with much difficulty that some of the drivers succeed, if

they do succeed, in keeping their bodies in connection with their souls. If some of the younger men do much more than this, the gain to the body is much more than counterbalanced by the damage to the soul, since success is won by poaching on preserves, dodging round corners in the dark at critical moments, or making the police partners in profits that are unlawful. Although there are five thousand eight hundred cabs in London, there is only authorized standing room for two thousand four hundred—or less than half. A large number of cabs regularly attend on the railway stations, but for the privilege of doing so the proprietors have to pay a handsome percentage to the companies. We are not certain that all of the railways are contracted for, but have been told that the cab contractor for the Great Eastern pays that company fifteen hundred pounds a year; if so, he will no doubt charge the cab proprietors two thousand pounds at the least. To account for the weight of this impost, it would appear that the railway stations afford a much more steady and profitable business than the streets generally.

In the present stage of two-wheeled pedestrianism, it would be premature, whilst treating of street conveyances for the use of the public, to bestow a lengthy notice on the velocipede, that remarkable machine which has astonished the streets of many of the provincial towns during the past two seasons. To mount and to drive a tandem of two wheels is often so arduous a labour, and the gain in locomotive power is so uncertain, that considerable improvements must yet be made in the machine before it will contribute materially to the superseding of bulkier and less dangerous vehicles. The time is no doubt at hand for laying much more stress on street railways, which under the crude management of a gasconading American of the name of Train, obtained a very unsuccessful introduction into this country some few years back. In Salford a street railway on a less objectionable plan than that of the American adventurer has been in existence for some years; it exhibits a line of two flat iron rails level with the pavement, with, for guiding purposes, a central groove between them in which runs a small wheel attached to the omnibus and lifted up from or restored to the groove at the option of the driver. The only advantages obtained by this form of street railway appear to be a somewhat diminished pull upon the horses, and a smoother progress for the ease of passengers. But nothing appears to be gained in speed, as the line is open to interruption from all sorts of slow vehicles; and, on the whole, we are not surprised that this plan has met with no great extension. Recently in Liverpool a fresh experiment with street rails for omnibuses

that are to stop only at certain fixed stations has begun to be tried. We suspect it is this example that has given the sudden strong impulse now visible to street tramway development, not only in Liverpool, but elsewhere. At a recent meeting of the Mersey Dock Board, it was stated that the Liverpool Tramways Company intend applying next session for powers to run over streets within the board's jurisdiction. Powers will also be sought by Messrs. Busby, extensive omnibus proprietors at Liverpool, to form a tramway, about three miles in length, from the Exchange to West Derby, one of the most populous suburbs of Liverpool. The promoters of the Metropolitan Tramways Bill have affixed notices in accordance with the Act on the following thoroughfares on which it is proposed to lay down tramways:—Holborn, High Holborn, Charterhouse-street, St. Martin's-le-Grand, Farringdon Road, Farringdon-street, New Bridge-street, Chatham Place, Black-friars Bridge, the new street to the Mansion House, Earl-street, Victoria-street, and New Earl-street. It is proposed to extend street tramways locomotion to Leeds, and notices have been given in the usual way that during the next session of Parliament application is to be made for an act to incorporate a company for making tramways. In Manchester three distinct companies are publishing similar notices. For the first scheme for a street tramway in the West of England, powers will be sought in the next session to lay down and work a tramway between the towns of Plymouth and Devonport. Application also is to be made next session for powers to lay down a connected system of street tramways throughout Glasgow and to different points in the vicinity. There will be two tramways on every line of street made use of, and each tramway will be five feet in breadth. It is intended to leave a clear space of ten feet between each line, consequently in a street of the average breadth—say 40 feet—there will be ten feet between the pavement and the nearest line, then five feet of tramway again, and ten feet once more between that and the opposite pavement. The tramways will consist of iron pavements, not unlike steelyard weighing machines, five feet and one inch in breadth, with sunk grooves to fit the car wheels, and ribbed or risen fretwork between the grooves to keep the horses from slipping, and, as the iron plates will be laid exactly on the same level with the causeway, it is said there will be no interruption or impediment to the other traffic. The cars will be low-set, with the wheels underneath, and not unlike railway carriages in outward appearance. They will be alike at both ends, and seated inside like an omnibus, but the passage between the rows of sitters will be much more ample than the

largest omnibus at present affords. Sitting accommodation will be provided for forty or fifty persons, and as many outside. At each end of the car there is a door and small platform, reached by one step, and faced by a 'splash-board ;' and passengers can enter the carriage from either end. The horses are attached to this platform, and the driver stands upon it with a powerful wheel-brake at hand, so that he can bring the car to a stand-still by a single turn of the wheel. On reaching the terminus the coupling gear is unhooked, and the horses are shifted to the other end, and this saves the necessity of turning round the carriage. The outside passengers reach their seats by a moveable trap-stair placed behind, and the sitting space is surrounded by an ornamental railing such as is seen on the promenade decks of our finest river steamers. There are, we learn, no fewer than nineteen street tramway schemes, for towns in England and Scotland, now standing to be dealt with in the next session of Parliament. It is evident that our street locomotion is on the eve of great changes.

A novelty in street locomotion is now attracting attention in Paris. One of the road steamers, with indiarubber tires to the wheels, invented by Thomson, of Edinburgh, has been running through the streets of Paris dragging behind it a heavy Versailles omnibus carrying 50 passengers. On the report of the French Government engineers, leave has been granted to the road steamer to pass over two routes, several miles in length, and including some busy parts of Paris. The engineers report it more handy and manageable than horses, and in no way dangerous to the public. The huge indiarubber tires save the machinery from jolting and the road from ruts. The speed is that of a fast omnibus. The steam carriage went up the paved street beside the Trocadero, of which the gradients are one in eleven, and often one in nine, without the least difficulty, and came down again without any brake.

In this country the absurdlest restrictions, at which posterity will laugh heartily, have been imposed on the use of steam locomotion in public highways. The foolish act is certain to be repealed, and the present generation will live to see a great extension of steam locomotion upon the common roads, as well as upon that bastard extension of the railway system which is now threatening to occupy our streets so largely.

Underground locomotion has obtained great triumphs in London; and by the cheap Tower subway, now on the eve of completion, as well as by Brunel's costly tunnel, it is promising to hold its own even under water. But it is to America that we turn for the reverse of this burrowing

system. In New York they have travelling in the air. The 'New York Elevated Railroad,' in its first section, on Greenwich-street, between the Battery and Cortlandt-street, is now completed and in running order. The following description is supplied in a New York journal, and would have been better if more lucid :—The first section of the line is run by a stationary engine in a cellar, which propels an endless steel rope, supported on trucks of four wheels, also running inside of rails at an interval of 150 feet. The frame of the trucks forms a triangle on the top, the cone of which is called a 'horn ;' this catches a 'lip' attached to a lever worked from the platform of the car, which, when lifted, allows the truck and rope to pass by, and the car remains stationary. In order to start the car again a turn of the lever is necessary, and then the truck catches the lip and the carriage is in motion. The car is about thirty feet in length. It will accommodate forty passengers. It runs on eight wooden wheels, three feet in diameter. Steel flanges one and three-quarters of an inch wide hold the wheels on to the track. On either side of the car are iron bars ten inches wide running the full length of the car within about two inches of the track, on which heavy elliptic springs support the body of the carriage. Should the wheels of the car leave the track, the bars on each side would prevent it from falling to the ground. Between these bars, underneath the floor of the car, are arranged six elliptic springs of two feet span, moving on wheels, which break the shock of the truck carrying the rope when the car is started. While under way there is scarcely any vibration felt; the track is apparently very solid, and the motion of the car very easy. The speed is regulated by the brakes, and the noise the car makes by running is scarcely perceptible. Horses view the moving mass overhead with indifference, and people underneath scarcely look up. The company propose to erect steam elevators to lift persons and baggage to the platform from which to step into the cars.

---

#### REPORTING AND REPORTERS.

A RECKLESS anti-State Churchman once divided mankind into men, women, and bishops. The constituents of public meetings are at least equally susceptible of a tripartite division—namely, into speakers, hearers, and reporters. Not that reporters always fail to be hearers also; and, in their

turn, speakers to boot. But their speaking in public is mostly amongst themselves, and concerns itself mainly with the details of their work, the length and order of their respective 'takes,' the comparative importance or otherwise of the speeches from the platform, the length or brevity of the required report of each speech, and the 'person'—whether 'first' or 'third'—in which it shall be couched. As for the *hearership* of reporters, that depends upon circumstances. If the speaker stands well with the public, the party, or the proprietor of the newspaper, he receives most careful attention from the 'gentlemen of the press.' But matters go quite differently if he is a speaker of but average consequence in the reporter's eyes; and nothing can be more trying to the temper of an ambitious orator whose right to be heard fully has not yet been stamped with the popular seal, than the *nonchalance* wherewith the reporters yawn, rest their pens, or converse, whilst he is speaking, or than the ruthlessness wherewith, if the meeting nears its close, they even shut their books and disappear. Reporters are, indeed, a class of themselves. Everybody recognises them, yet few know very much about them. On all public occasions they are to be seen; yet they are not of the public, take no pleasure in what most tickles the public, are usually calm, cool, unsympathetic, even when the public is convulsed, and see with equal eye, as reporters of all, the meeting's hero discomfited, or its sparrow fall. Whilst others are enjoying at their ease graceful turns of eloquence, or luxuriating in the happy glitter of platform wit, the reporters are working like slaves, receiving with serious ears, and poring with wrinkled foreheads over, the speaker's most brilliant displays. No matter how affecting the discourse may be, they remain all impassive to the pathos. When the hall begins to empty itself, and the gas is about to be turned off, the public retires, feeling that all is over; but the reporters go away knowing that much is only begun. For hours, it may be, of rapid and laborious transcription and condensation are still before them; and whilst the public is sleeping in its bed, the reporters are feeding the compositors with 'copy,' and are earning, by continued night toil, half a forenoon's repose.

If Talleyrand's rule against zeal were always good, and if it were as desirable to cultivate the *nil admirari* art as Horace and Pope declare it to be, 'to make men happy, or to keep them so,' perhaps no surer way of effecting these could be found than in undergoing a long apprenticeship on the reporting staff. However decided his opinions, earnest his zeal, or ardent his admiration of a person, a party, or a cause, the

neophyte in reporting must have a mind of unusual strength of fibre if these are not to suffer much abatement in the course of the exercise of his profession. Like a tissue steeped with rapid vicissitudes in things hot, cold, wet, and dry, his mind naturally becomes covered, as with a tough skin, with moral and intellectual impassivity. He who is to-night at a missionary meeting will be early next morning, perhaps, at a prize fight. At one hour he is invoked to rescue the Church and conserve the State from the onslaughts of a semi-demoniac premier; a few hours before he was called on to rejoice in the advent to supreme power of a minister who, above all others, is wise to understand and strong to accomplish the imperative and blessed disestablishing duty of the times. At a licensed victuallers' dinner yesterday, to-day he is seated near the platform of the United Kingdom Alliance. Now he is steeping his soul in a fine flow of Fenian eloquence, against which anon he is reporting appeals to magistrates and the executive for stern measures of repression. At one moment commissioned to record the rivalries of racehorses and the latest betting of the ring; ere long he will be listening, pen in hand, to the solemn harangues of a Dean Close or of a Dr. M'Neile. Just now it is a theatrical notice that he is preparing; his next task will be reporting the outline of a funeral sermon, or the performances of a priesthood with cope, chasuble, and candle. The shrewdest forecasts of practical statesmanship occupy his note-book to-night; on the morrow he must report, as patiently as possible, the doings of a parish vestry, or the harrowing delirations of a Cumming. In the exercise of his *quasi* ubiquitous duties, he was sitting last night where the most earnest appeals to the eternal interests of his soul were pressing upon his ears; to-night he is following the vagaries of a secularist lecturer, and sits *vis-a-vis* with some female atheist who 'talks him dead.' It is at one moment a military review or an election riot that he is watching. In a little while he will be viewing the scorched bodies of a colliery explosion, or writing down the evidence adduced before the coroner and his jury. Again, it is the bursting of a reservoir of which he is collecting the particulars; or he is gathering up the details of a gas explosion, pursuing the traces and consequences of a burglary, or describing the horrible incidents of a murder. No sooner is his mind allured or compelled into one attitude than it is hurried away into another; sympathy and antipathy, rejoicing and lamentation, burlesque and tragic feeling, religious light, superstitious twilight and pagan darkness, philanthropic earnestness, and worse than utter indifferentism, succeed each other

in rapid flow, until in the whirl of a dissipation so varied and incessant, he is too apt to settle at last in the conviction that all causes are equally well or ill founded, all persuasions alike unsound or sound, all events on one level of real importance or unimportance, and the popularity of the day or the sensational value of a deed the only authentic test of the intrinsic worth of events, men, principles, and parties. One compensation for this deteriorating tendency upon its servant is derived by the public at large in the almost judicial coolness wherewith the experienced reporter is able to sit amidst the wrack of political elements or the crash of religious worlds. He is almost always a latitudinarian in theology. His instinct, indeed, is to be intolerant of religious and philanthropic earnestness in all their forms. He is usually intensely bigoted against what he conceives to be bigotry; and this bigotry of his inclines him to report in opposition to all religious doctrine, and in favour of all that fritters life away in aimless indifferentisms, excepting perhaps in the political field. In all other respects he can write with a calm impartiality, and be like a mirror, reflecting, without exaggeration, the most conflicting varieties of opinion. The bias, if not against 'bigotry,' which is sometimes evident in a report, is usually that of the journal in which the report appears, and not that of the mind of the reporter. It is due to him, also, to confess that the hasty or, it may be, the prejudiced pen of the sub-editor is sometimes run through parts of the reporter's work, and that insertions are occasionally made in the editor's room with which the reporter is not in the least chargeable. He has his own personal aversions, but these come out most markedly against the twaddling bore of a speaker who, having nothing at all to say, occupies a full hour in saying it. Him it is the delight of the contemptuous reporter to 'crumple up,' and next morning the public must satisfy itself with the information that the honourable member made some remarks which were inaudible in the gallery, or that Mr. Higgins, at some length, supported the resolution. Truth compels us to say that misreporting has not always been unintentional. A reporter has been known to take revenge in this way. And we once heard a very ungrammatical councilman gravely bring it before the town council as a grievance that a certain reporter had, with malice aforethought, put into the newspaper a verbatim report of one of his speeches. It is well remembered, on the other hand, that O'Connell at one time offended the Parliamentary reporters. They did not misreport, but took a more deadly revenge, and till he made his peace with them their reports entirely ignored him. We have already

hinted that whilst the reporter is often a very keen discerner as well as a hater of cant, unfortunately he sometimes sees it where it is not, and confounds sincere earnestness, especially if religious, with its most hypocritical simulatives. Very often he is proud of his own intelligence, of which he has an immovable opinion, and sits ludicrously perched in a lofty judgment seat, even over men of the widest executive capacity and the most comprehensive intelligence. Of his professional privileges he is acutely jealous. At a great price of self-assertion, and by slow degrees, reportership has won for itself during the last half century a distinguished place; and conductors of meetings are pretty well aware now that it is important to afford to the gentlemen of the press those superior facilities for seeing, hearing, and recording that the efficient exercise of their profession requires. Any slight put upon them in this respect will probably be both keenly felt and sorely resented. And when, as sometimes happens, they have to deal with some jack-in-office who ignores the respect they deem due to their intelligence and function, they are apt, with a strong *esprit de corps*, to make common cause against him, and to repay the injury in a manner not at all conducive to his comfort or self-complacence.

The art of shorthand writing is of great antiquity. It is believed to have originated amongst the Greeks, and to have been transmitted by them to the Romans. Plutarch, in his life of Cato, tells how Cicero, the consul, had dispersed about the senate-house several expert writers whom he had taught to make certain symbols, and who did, in little and short strokes equivalent to words, pen down all he said. Martial's lines are well known—

Currant verba licet, manus est velocior illis,  
Nondum lingua suum, dextra peregit opus.

The art, however, was lost with the old Roman civilisation, and though re-appearing occasionally in the interval, has only during the last half century come largely into the service of mankind. A knowledge of shorthand to the reporter is highly desirable,—indeed, in these days, it may be said to be indispensable. But this is only one of his qualifications, and not always the most important. There are gentlemen of the press that still remember brilliant instances of reporting competency on the part of professionals who were entirely unacquainted with any kind of stenography. In an abbreviated longhand, but quite legible enough to avail for the use of the compositor, there were men in the profession some thirty years ago who could keep up with a rapid speaker,

though omitting all his mere verbiage, and have ready for the press, when he sat down, a remarkably accurate and long, though, of course, condensed report of his harangue. We knew a gentleman of such powerful and well-trained memory, that he could write at his leisure a wonderfully correct report of a meeting entirely from recollection without a note; and another who, in our presence in an assize court, having been diligently transcribing from notes the report of a previous meeting, was yet able to write from memory a correct paragraph giving the details of the trial of each prisoner immediately on its conclusion. Still spoken of are the days of 'Memory Woodfall,' who, by the aid of hard-boiled eggs, was used to sit out the debates in Parliament, and wrote their substance from recollection afterwards. The famous Dr. Abernethy, when lecturing at one of the metropolitan hospitals, once set his face most resolutely against the reporters. He was so determined that the *Lancet* should not publish his lectures, that he spared no device of espionage or threat to discover which of the students was the culprit; and even, on one occasion, had the lights put out, and lectured in the dark. The excellent memory of Mr. Wakley's reporter defeated all his attempts. It often happens now that a reporter will be, concurrently, writing from notes what a previous speaker had said, and putting into his note book the leading features of a speech then in course of delivery. But the great triumphs of memory or of rapid longhand reporting, once familiar to the press, are no longer to be found. They have been rendered unnecessary by great improvements in stenography effected during the last quarter of a century. From the sixteenth century onwards shorthand has had its English inventors and improvers; but prior to the publications of Mr. Isaac Pitman it was a rude art, difficult to be proficiently acquired, and untrustworthy at the best of times if the reading was not aided by the still retentive memory. Gurney, Byrom, Taylor, and Harding's improved Taylor, were the best systems in use; the two latter being the most popular. It is easy to learn to write these; but the reading of what is written,—in that the art and mighty labour lies. One sometimes sees advertisements of a system of shorthand, which is really Taylor's, and the promise that thereby 'the nature of the art can be acquired in six hours' is fair-seeming enough to those who know nothing of the matter. But although the nature of the art may be learned in six hours, the efficient practice of it on that system requires an apprenticeship of six years. Not so with Pitman's sound-hand, which is easier to be read than to be written, and for all practical purposes is beyond

all comparison superior to any other system. Reporting passed into a new era after the appearance of Pitman's phonography. A remarkable memory ceased to be of much consequence, and the exercise of clever long-hand reporting became limited almost wholly to the writers of Parliamentary summaries. Phonography has brought into the humbler ranks of journalism many hundreds who, but for it, would never have been able to hold a place there, and has enabled newspaper proprietors to obtain a rapid development of reporting assistance at a time when, otherwise, the sudden extension of the newspaper system consequent on the repeal of the taxes on knowledge would have rendered such a supply absolutely impossible. It has led, however, to some serious mistakes and many ludicrous failures. A raw youth has no sooner got its strokes, curves, and dots at his finger ends than he has considered himself competent for reportership on the press; and whilst hundreds who have advanced thus far have vainly waited year after year in the hope of obtaining an introduction to the reporters' room, many who have secured the coveted *entrée* have soon discovered their utter and hopeless inadequacy for the function to which they have aspired. A tale is told of a man of this class, who considered himself quite equal to taking his turn in the House of Commons for the *Times*. Accordingly, a longish 'take' was entrusted to him, and with his book full of notes he returned to the *Times* office to commence the transcription of his notes for the press. Mr. Barnes, the then editor, asked him how much his take amounted to; and finding it was long, directed him to cut it down by one-half. The reporter, dividing his book into two halves with his finger, meekly asked the editor 'which half?' So much simplicity, it is said, would not do for the *Times*; and the ambitious shorthand writer got no second trial. Another story is told of a mere shorthand writer who took a first turn in 'the House' for a London morning journal, but, on returning to the office and seeing the other reporters driving their quills with electric speed across the paper, the spectacle of swift and skilful industry so alarmed him that he disappeared, and was never seen in London afterwards. Rapid speed in transcription is a great requisite in writing for the newspapers. The duties of a shorthand writer are simple, those of a reporter complex and manifold. The one has merely to hear, note, and transcribe; his services are required in courts of law, arbitration rooms, and in other circumstances where the *ipsissima verba* of a witness or a judge may afterwards be required. This function, by long practice, becomes chiefly mechanical; it is possible to take a very

correct note of a long speech, and yet not be able to give, at the end, more than a bad guess of what it was about. In the case of the Government shorthand writers the task of transcription is committed to other hands than those of the note-taker. With the reporter, on the other hand, shorthand is only an occasional requisite; much that he does can be effected without it. Comparatively seldom is he required to produce an exactly literal record of what was said; indeed, however important the occasion, there are very few speakers who can be reported verbatim without damage to their reputation as composers of English. Of course, at times, the power to follow accurately a most rapid utterance with the pen is of signal value to the reporter, who ought to be equal to every emergency.

We have alluded to the variety of the work falling to the gentlemen of the press. There are, indeed, some whose office it is to attend Parliamentary debates almost exclusively; but in the provinces a first-class reporter is expected to discharge a wide variety of duties; and the major part of the profession are all the fitter for their post in proportion as they resemble Dryden's Villiers :

A man so various that he seemed to be  
Not one, but all mankind's epitome;  
Who, in the course of one revolving moon,  
Was statesman, fiddler, courtier, and buffoon.

Nothing in which the public at large is supposed to take interest is out of his sphere. He may justly say, 'I am a reporter :'

'*Nihil humani a me alienum puto.*'

The political or the philanthropic meeting, the complimentary dinner, the flower show, or the agricultural show, would not go on so well without him; he attends at consecrations, ordinations, and cricket matches; he is busy at the hustings and at the polling-booth; he lays every foundation stone, inaugurates everything, and sometimes rides to a conflagration on a fire engine; he visits churches, chapels, hotels, theatres, law courts, inquests, racecourses, mines, regattas, executions; wherever fire, storm, and flood, wherever collision or explosion work scenes of damage and woe, our reporter is immediately upon the spot; he attends the Royal progress, and the exercises of the army; the gala days and holidays of other people bring only extra labour and anxiety to him. The public at large know nothing of what is done in our courts of law except what the reporter communicates; and by his

statements upon men and things public opinion is to no small extent modified and formed. The occurrence of a moment may change one of his quietest into one of his most busy days, may upset the most carefully-revised arrangements, and defeat his most cherished plans. He is no more able to predict where he will be at a given time in advance, or to make a private appointment that shall be binding, than is a fireman or a medical man. By night or day he must set off, by rail, road, or river, in sunshine or in storm, with notice or with none, replete or hungry, exhausted or refreshed, to the spot where inquiries have to be made, events to be traced, or their consequences to be discovered. He should be sound in wind and limb, and have not only all his wits about him, but should know how to avail himself of other people's. He ought to be a man of general information; deeply versed in anything he can hardly be expected to be, but a little about everything he should know by all means, so that he may never be at a loss in his multifarious duties. The *omne scibile* is his domain; happy, if he can in any wise cover it, though only as a smatterer, since no piece of knowledge can be so out-of-the-way as not at some time in his career to give him an advantage over his competitors. He is, or should be, a critic in art, music, the drama, and literature; and, of course, the more he knows in each of these departments the more creditable is his work likely to be. Of late years, it is true, the expansion of the provincial press has necessitated much more division of labour in reporting and criticising; and with all the dailies, the theatre, the concert room, the picture gallery, and books, are now usually remitted to special hands. Yet the general reporter is still all the more valuable in proportion as he can operate, at least in an emergency, in every direction. He should have faculty readily to divine the meaning as well as to catch the words of a speaker, and, indeed, rather the meaning than the words; for the excellence of a report consists in its fairly representing rather what the speaker meant to say, and thought or hoped he did say, than what, in the exigencies of the moment, he actually succeeded in saying. In fact, the reporter should be able, where requisite, to mend not only a halting and clumsy style, but also the very matter of a speech; and where necessary, as most often it is, to compress the gist of a verbose argument or the points of a lengthy speech into a nutshell. Seeing, moreover, that the law of libel is so defective as to fail to protect an honest report of a public meeting, he should have enough legal acumen to know how to keep on the safe side. He should be possessed of some descriptive and narrative power; and the

more grammatical his training the better for the language, which in our day he, perhaps more than any one else, contributes to form or to deform. Newspaper English, indeed, so far as it comes from him, too often presents symptoms of debasement. He will, for instance, record how So-and-So sustained serious injury—which, after all, the sufferer proves not to have sustained, seeing that, unhappily, he died under it. He will substitute a barbarism like *now-a-days* for *in our days*, and will sometimes drag in provincialisms to the utter confusion of the sense. There is in a midland town a street called the Pavement. A reporter we knew, in a paragraph relating the exploits of a thief, astonished the reading public of that town by stating that, having secured the booty, the thief ‘took up the Pavement, and disappeared!’ The public might well fail to understand so subterraneous a procedure. Another paragraph writer of our acquaintance was sadly apt to flounder in composition through a provoking want of flexibility in his style. He was much teased by the other reporters for having once told the world, through his newspaper, that the legs of a poor man found dead on a lime-kiln ‘were discovered, being literally roasted by one of the men.’ Almost every newspaper report of inquest or accident shews a slovenly misuse of the word ‘when.’ ‘The boiler exploded, when three men were scalded,’ writes the reporter, although in truth the boiler burst not when the men were scalded, but previous to their becoming so. Again, ‘The deceased ran away, when the intoxicated prisoner beat out her brains with the poker.’ On the contrary, the reporter should have told us that the deceased ran away, and that thereupon, or immediately afterwards, the prisoner beat out her brains with the poker. But we must not expand here into criticism. Reporters’ English is often written under very high pressure, and amidst difficulties which make its occasional incorrectness anything but surprising. In hunting out facts, and disembarrassing them of the distortions, screens and disguises superinduced by interested or stupid persons, the reporter is sometimes called upon to exercise the cleverness and astuteness of a detective. Discrimination, tact, patience, and perseverance are all needed; men must be known as well as things. There must be, withal, physical courage to work amidst danger, and moral courage to act impartially in circumstances of bias, and sometimes not a little rectitude to withhold the hand from the taking of bribes. That there are many members of the profession who do not come up to the fair standard is certain, but there are some who do; and on the whole, comparing the past with the present, the efficiency

and respectability of the gentlemen of the press seems to us to have improved of late years, and it is no longer a matter of course, as it once almost was, that the reporter should be a man whose tastes are low, and whose moral principles are undiscoverable. It must be confessed that the nocturnal habits, and the various uncertainties of occupation, which no reporter can avoid, are unfavourable to the younger members of the staff, rendering unusually easy the fall into moral scepticism and social irregularity. Temptations to drink beset their path on all sides, and too often blight a promising career. At public dinners it is frequently considered a mark of proper attention to see that 'the press' is supplied with wine; and moving amongst society of all grades, and travelling from place to place, as reporters do, invitations to drink recur again and again, and the necessities of their work often throw reporters into hotels or make what the publican provides their readiest substitute for a meal. Many a situation has been lost, many a downward career inaugurated, by a glass of wine thoughtlessly imbibed at a public dinner, and so operating on the brain as to make the reporter's note-taking useless. In one case within our knowledge, the mingled shame and despair consequent upon a dismissal so caused, led to the perpetration of suicide. Independently of any other consideration, the work of a reporter is one that requires the full possession of all his faculties; and if there is any class to whom abstemiousness is more necessary than to others, reporters ought assuredly to consider themselves therein. If once accustomed to work upon alcoholic stimulus, the man may be considered as lost. Thenceforward he can do nothing without his dram or his glass; and in the end he falls a sure victim to an ever-increasing necessity for buying his working efficiency with an unnatural stimulation.

The life of a reporter on an influential and enterprising journal is full of incident, and this fact gives some compensation for the excessive labour he is at times called on to perform, in the opportunities it yields for making intimate acquaintanceship with men and things. The reporter belongs to a privileged order, and is to a certain extent behind the scenes of society. He approaches the popular idols of the day somewhat nearer than most people do, and in some cases, it must be owned, this superior familiarity results in contempt. If he is not so easily excited by eloquence as others—in that respect resembling the countryman who did not cry at a touching sermon, because he belonged to another parish—he has frequent opportunities of being roused by the presence of danger. It is given to few to record death's doings on the

battle field, like Dr. Russell ; but there has never been any lack of men ready to step forward at the call of professional duty, and risk to limb and life is run to an extent of which few outside the profession are aware. We have known life saved and property protected at imminent hazard by reporters at a fire ; and have seen serious risks encountered for the sake of obtaining information for the press. Of late years signal service has been rendered to the public by newspaper emissaries who have investigated the sanitary condition of our large towns, and conducted inquiries into the nature, causes, extent, and remedies of such wide-spread calamities as the potato famine in Ireland, the cotton famine in Lancashire, and the more recent mining distress in Cornwall. In not a few of our teeming hives of industry or of enforced idleness, the reporter has penetrated, regardless of his own danger, into the inmost haunts of typhus and cholera, to make the public acquainted with the plague-spots in their midst ; and we have known him receive the heartfelt thanks of poor people doomed to dwell in such misery, because his exertions have shamed dilatory authorities into grappling with their duty. It sometimes occurs at political gatherings that the reporters share in the favours intended for the real *dramatis personæ*. A rotten egg, falling short of a candidate, is very likely to drop in the reporters' box ; and if there be a general row the holders of pencils and note books must take care of themselves. One diminutive reporter of our acquaintance, on account of the lowness of his stature suffered many indignities. He was once thrown bodily over the front of a hustings by a stalwart and excited coalheaver. We have heard an old reporter tell how in his slimmer youth, his light weight and small size obtained him admission to a post of duty otherwise inaccessible. He was recognised by the densely packed and impenetrable mob as the reporter for their favourite journal, and was lifted up and actually allowed to walk all across a large room upon their shoulders to his place on the platform. The natural impulse of most people, on the occasion of an election row, is to make off as speedily as possible, but a way of escape is not always open, and a reporter, for his part, ought to be able to describe the scene. We recollect how on one occasion half-a-dozen reporters stood shoulder to shoulder at the declaration of the poll, and successfully defended their box from the intrusion of a beer-maddened crowd until the police arrived to their succour. We have a vivid recollection of a meeting called in support of the Irish Church about the time of the late general election, and ending in a battle for the possession of the platform, wherein

doctors of divinity, aldermen, ministers of religion, and the general public set to in earnest, and incidentally smashed the reporters' table, chairs, forms, and their own hats, with unparalleled alacrity and completeness. Nothing less than the introduction of a *posse* of policemen availed to restore order.

The reminiscences of a reporter of experience and good memory would contain many things that to the uninitiated might savour too strongly of Munchausen. What would be thought, for instance, of the statement that a town jury, finding a prisoner guilty, recommended him to mercy because they had 'some doubt as to his being the man?' Yet that verdict was given in our hearing. *Primâ facie* it might seem impossible that any man could make such blunders as now and again creep into print. Where these are not due to the influence of alcohol, much allowance should be made. The reporter for the press has to do much of his work against time. When an important meeting is likely to be long this is provided against by sending a staff of two or more reporters; and in the Houses of Parliament relays of reporters succeed each other as the time wears on, from the commencement of the business to its close. At the best, however, the reporter is expected to transcribe his report from his notes hurriedly, often in a badly-lighted and much-jolting railway carriage, sometimes in a post-chaise or a cab, and always when to a certain extent his strength is lowered by his labours at the meeting, or before. It is not wonderful, then, that blunders are made; yet sometimes, it must be allowed, these are inexcusable. It is to the printer, however, that many blunders are due. Not long ago a west country reporter had occasion to refer to the well-known passage in one of Mr. Gladstone's finest speeches: 'We have burned our boats and destroyed our bridges.' In a local paper, thanks to the printer, he was made to say that the Premier informed the House that he had burned his coats and destroyed his breeches. We have known jokes of this kind foisted in by the compositor out of sheer mischief. When drink exercises its influence the most absurd results unintentionally follow, but in such cases they rarely come before the public, thanks to the corrective care of the official reader for the press. We recollect one reporter who, under the effects of champagne at a public dinner, found that he could take notes with most delightful and unprecedented facility, but unhappily discovered the decyphering of them to be quite a different matter. Another, whose intellect had been temporarily marred from a like cause, refused to write a word of the speech of one of our greatest statesmen, on the

ground that it was of no consequence ! If it was not drink, it was laziness and worse, that actuated a reporter sent down from a London daily to record the proceedings at the very important trial of a public functionary not very long ago. He remained at his hotel whilst the proceedings were in progress from day to day, merely sending the 'Boots' to ascertain that the court was sitting ! His reliance, of course, was on the local papers, from which he copied punctually his own 'special report.' With the story of Mark Supple, one of the early Parliamentary reporters, who electrified the House during a lull in the proceedings by tipsily calling on 'Mishter Shpeaker' for a song, most people are familiar. A story has recently travelled from America, and if not true, may be thought well invented. A reporter is said to have stated of a certain lecture that 'it was a brilliant affair. The hall ought to have been filled, but only forty persons were present. The speaker commenced by saying that he was by birth an ecclesiastical deduction ; and gave a learned description of Satan and his skill in sawing trees. Among other things, he stated that the patriarch Abraham taught Cecrops arithmetic.' Next day the lecturer wrote to say : ' You have made some mistakes which I wish to correct. You make me speak of myself as by birth an ecclesiastical deduction. What I said was, that I was not by birth but only ecclesiastically a Dutchman. Instead of speaking of Satan as sawing trees, I spoke of him as sowing tares. I said nothing of Abraham, but spoke of the Arabians as nomads of patriarchal simplicity ; and said of Cecrops that he was the founder of Athens, and instructed the people in agriculture.'

Some things, considered rather 'smart,' might be chronicled concerning reporters, especially in regard to the rivalry between different newspapers in obtaining early or exclusive information. But the extension of telegraphy has done much, and the consequent associated press system will do more, in putting an end to contests of this kind, except for matters of merely local importance. In days of yore, when Earl, then Lord John, Russell was member for North Devon, a renowned race took place from Exeter to London, with reports of one of his speeches, between Mr. Dickens, then a reporter for the *Morning Chronicle*, and a gentleman still on the staff of the *Times*. Both posted, but on the way Mr. Dickens gave the slip to his friend, who rode quietly along imagining that he was in advance instead of in the rear, and did not discover his error until he saw the speech in the *Chronicle*. Occasionally such rivalries resulted in what is called 'sharp practice,' which means out-and-out roguery, but for the

most part they were, and, where necessary to be carried on, still are conducted with fair play and in good humour. We do not adduce it as an instance of correct conduct, but we have heard of the exploit of a reporter who had attended a meeting far away from home, and who, having left in good time to catch the return train, found to his dismay that the representative of an opposition paper had by remaining a few minutes later obtained the speech of a gentleman of some position. What was to be done? Personally as well as professionally he did not like to be beaten; so, being well acquainted with the style of the speaker, whom he had heard upon the same subject before, he resolved to write a speech for him, and actually produced what proved to be about as good a report as his rival's. We knew a clever but wayward youth, son of the editor of a provincial newspaper, who, on an occasion of unusual interest, gratuitously invented a long speech for the clerk to a board of guardians, whose indignation on seeing it in print may be imagined. Sometimes reporters have even amused themselves by kindly supplying inventions of this kind to some unsuspecting brother of the press whom accident or necessity has prevented from arriving at the commencement of the proceedings. But jokes of this class are, of course, too serious in their consequences to be often attempted. A reporter who is gifted with ready sources enjoys manifold advantages over his less quick-witted brethren. One of the most annoying instances that occurs to us of the want of presence of mind on the part of a reporter happened at a boat-race in the North, whither a reporter had been despatched on horseback to bring back the name of the winner. He saw the first boat reach the goal, and galloped home at full speed, but when asked who had won, was only able to say that although he had seen the boat pass he had forgotten to inquire its name.

There are few old reporters; either they melt away through dissipation or they subside into some less active occupation. Many reporters have risen to eminence in other professions, and especially have some of them made the gallery in the House of Commons the stepping-stone to the bar, the bench, and even the woolsack. Of one quondam Parliamentary reporter who had left the gallery for the floor of the House of Commons, his erewhile associates were wont to say spitefully that he was not fit for a reporter, and therefore had been made a member. In the ranks of journalism itself, the transition from the composing room to the reporters' office, and thence to the editor's chair, has been frequently achieved.

Our sketch of reporting and reporters would be incomplete did it not contain some reference to the casual reporters,

popularly known as 'penny-a-liners'—though that epithet by no means exactly indicates their scale of remuneration. They are, to the regularly attached staff of a journal, very much what skirmishers are to the main body of an army; or perhaps they may be more aptly described as the guerillas of the press. It is their business to pick up whatever item of unexpected or stray news they can secure, and forward it with all speed to the journals to which they think it will be acceptable; and, as they are paid according to the quantity used, their habit is to inflate and enlarge, by every device of roundabout phraseology, the material at their command. If the 'liner' can get his 'copy' into four or five journals he is well paid, and several of the fraternity, with good connections of this kind, make an excellent living out of it. The 'copy' the 'liner' supplies is technically known as 'flimsey,' being written in manifold on tissue paper, with the help of sheets of carbonised transferring paper, commonly known as 'blacks.' Occasionally, when news is scarce, the 'liner' is suspected of indulging in sheer invention, and a few years ago one made much profit, for a short time, out of an imaginary conference between Italian patriots, the reports of whose proceedings were published day by day in the metropolitan newspapers, until the cheat was discovered. Such cases as these, however, are very rare. The certainty of their detection happily renders the reporter's production of such stuff an act of professional suicide.

---

#### THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

IT is one of the 'things not generally known' that there exists on the statute book of this country, thanks to officials connected with the War Office and the Admiralty, 'An Act for the better Prevention of Contagious Diseases at certain Naval and Military Stations,' supplemented with 'An Act to Amend' the said Contagious Diseases Act. What is perhaps even yet more important is the fact that there exists an association for the further extension of the application of these enactments. We propose to inquire briefly, in the following article, into the character of these Acts, and to recite some reasons against their proposed extension.

And, first of all, we have to report that the Contagious

Diseases Act, surprising though this may seem to the public at large, has nothing whatever to do with cattle. Had it been called the Disgraceful Diseases Act, that would have been straightforward, but it might also have been alarming. The association engaged in promotion of the system is little disposed to lose ground through lack of cautiousness, or of skill in entitling. The Shameful Diseases Act would, perhaps, scarcely have been smuggled through Parliament under any such name. Curiosity was kept fast asleep by the use of less precise, and therefore more convenient nomenclature.

The Contagious Diseases Act, as existing prior to last session, was the sequel and successor to a previous Act, passed by Parliament in 1864. Two years afterwards that Act was repealed, but only that this larger and more stringent law might stand in its place. It bears date 11th June, 1866, and forms the 35th chapter of the statutes of the 29th of Victoria. Two successive blows of the mallet were thus applied to the wedge, of which the thin end is now fixed in the legislation of this country; and yet a third blow was dealt last session. The advocates of this peculiar legislation succeeded last year in passing their third bill, as 'An Act to amend the Contagious Diseases Act, 1866,' bearing date August 11th, 1869, and standing as chapter 96 of the 32nd and 33rd of Victoria. By this extension they effected several modifications in the details of the law, and they enlarged the territorial area of its application. The Act of 1866 applied to twelve districts—Portsmouth, Plymouth, and Devonport, Woolwich, Chatham, Sheerness, Aldershot, Windsor, Colchester, Shorncliffe, The Curragh, Cork, and Queenstown. The amendment Act extended the application of this legislation to six other districts—Canterbury, Dover, Gravesend, Maidstone, Southampton, and Winchester, besides enlarging the boundaries of some of the twelve. Thus to Colchester were added the outlying parishes of St. Andrew's, Greenstead; Lexden; and St. Michael's, Mile End. To Plymouth and Devonport were joined on Ivy Bridge; the parishes of Plympton St. Maurice and Plympton St. Mary; and Dartmouth. To Sheerness was appended the Isle of Grain. To Shorncliffe were added Walmer, Deal, Sholden, Mongeham, Ringwold, and Ripple. To Windsor—Datchet and Upton. And to Woolwich—St. Paul and St. Nicholas, Deptford; the hamlet of Hatcham; and St. Alphage, Greenwich. Moreover, the radius of five miles around all these districts was increased to fifteen. It is no secret that the object of the promoters is ultimately to bring the whole nation under the provisions of this Act, wind and weather permitting. The opponents of the Act, who

are likely to become many as soon as its nature shall be generally known, are bestirring themselves busily in London, Nottingham, Bristol, and elsewhere, to make the wind of public opinion contrary, and to turn the weather into a storm.

Before proceeding further we may allude to the fact that the question, whether or not this Contagious Diseases Act should be extended to the civil population, was discussed in the Health Department of the Social Science Association at its latest congress. Much excitement was manifested in the proceedings of the day, and a rare warmth was infused into the debate. Mr. W. P. Swain and Mr. Berkeley Hill read papers in favour of the measure, and were supported by Mr. T. Woolcombe (chairman of the Royal Albert Hospital), Mr. P. H. Holland, Mr. D. Davies, Dr. Symonds, and others; but were opposed by a numerous body, including Dr. Charles Taylor, the Rev. W. Arthur, Professor Newman, Mr. R. Charleton, Mr. T. Worth, and other more or less well-known clergymen or philanthropists. A resolution adverse to the Act was moved by the Rev. W. Arthur, and seconded by Professor Newman; a cautious amendment to this was moved—the reporter does not say by whom—approving of the Act as existing, but adding that the time had not arrived for an extension of it to the civil population. When the time came for the vote great disturbance ensued. The amendment was lost, as also was a more straightforward one, moved by Mr. Davies and seconded by Dr. Beddoe, bluntly approving of the proposed extension of the Act. Finally, the original resolution was carried. The correspondent of the *Times* gave the following partisan description of the scene:—

'There then followed a scene of great confusion and disorder. A large number of persons, many of them apparently clergymen, had come to the meeting for the express purpose of protesting against the Act. In debate the advocates on both sides waxed warm, and the enthusiasm of those who fancied they saw in physical disease a Divine judgment against moral transgression was obviously much in the ascendant over the calmer views of more reasonable men. Excited gentlemen, in white cravats, surged tumultuously over the benches, vociferated, half-a-dozen at once, set the chairman to rights about his ruling on points of order, and loudly applauded whatever seemed to tell in favour of their views. At length, after a time probably without parallel in the history of Science Congresses, and, after resolutions and amendments had been put and stormed over, a resolution in opposition to the extension of the Act was carried by about two to one in a meeting of rather more than one hundred. The proceedings were, of course, not of a character to give weight to the decision of the assembly or to increase the value set by sober-minded men upon the action of the association itself.'

We cannot but note here how very apparent is the bias of the reporter, although we are not prepared to doubt that a state of mind far from judicial was shown by some of the opponents of the Act. Indeed, in some of their publications there is

a vehemence of excitement that positively tends to prejudice men of calm judgment against their cause. Their arguments, we must say, would tell more powerfully if they were urged with less of a shriek.

The opponents of this kind of legislation adduce a variety of considerations. We cannot say that these are always in harmony with each other. The best of the earlier series of arguments against it were advanced in a report on the operation of the Contagious Diseases Act, presented by John Simon, F.R.S. and F.R.C.S., and surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital, and were printed in the Blue Book containing the eleventh annual report of the medical officer to the Lords of Her Majesty's Privy Council. Probably the most energetic individual agitator against the Acts is Mr. Worth, a surgeon and member of the board of guardians, at Nottingham, and author of several pamphlets on the subject. A *brochure*, entitled 'The Remedy Worse than the Disease,' lies before us, published by the Society for the Rescue of Young Women and Children, 85, Queen-street, Cheapside, London, and entering a very strong protest 'against legislative measures for the regulation (and tending to the encouragement) of prostitution, as exemplified in the provisions and working of the Contagious Diseases Act, 1866.' Mrs. Hume Rothery, a daughter of the celebrated Joseph Hume of Parliamentary memory, has written letters protestant, as also have Professor F. W. Newman, Mr. Robert Charleton, sundry other philanthropists, and several ministers of religion. Professor Newman, besides letters in the *Anti-Vaccinator*, has written, on the whole, the most powerful remonstrance against the new legislation that we have seen. It is entitled 'the Cure of the Great Social Evil,' and is published in London by Trübner & Co. It deals at large with the question of incontinence, and suggests a variety of preventive and deterrent measures. We do not in all the details agree with Mr. Newman's observations. There are certain physiological and psychological facts that he ignores. It is a deplorable fact, for instance, that by early and long indulgence in impure acts and imaginations, one may utterly cease to possess that 'gift of continence' which is originally at the command of almost all. We say almost all, because, again, it is a deplorable fact that some few are so weighed down by the sins of an impure ancestry—in short, so dreadfully animal in their very constitution, with so little intellect and moral sense to counteract, that the appetite is as imperious and irresistible as hunger or thirst. For these, on the whole, St. Paul's advice is the best in spite of Mr. Newman's protest against it, and notwithstanding one's pity for

the wives. But in the main, Mr. Newman treats the subject so admirably that we cannot but recommend his pamphlet for the widest possible distribution. The 'National Anti-Contagious Diseases Act (Extension) Association' is excellent in everything except its name. *Existence* would be a much better word than *extension*, if a word there were really necessary. This association has published a variety of documents, a list of which will no doubt be gladly forwarded to any inquirer by Mr. Robert Charleton, of Abbey Down, Bristol, to whom, as treasurer of the society, subscriptions may be sent. In one of his letters, Professor Newman accounts for the passing of the Acts, by stating that 'certain physicians have the ear of the Privy Council and indoctrinate it. The Privy Council moves the ministry—if it be not quite the same body—and the whispers of the ministry carry the doctors' bill through Parliament. The newspapers (I conjecture) think the subject too disgusting to argue, and therefore are silent. Thus we are under an insidious despotism.' The silence of the newspapers whilst the subject was before Parliament was certainly remarkable. The reporters appear to have unanimously agreed not to report—their bias, we suppose, being in favour of the Act, and their belief being great in the safeness of the policy of letting the public know as little as possible about it.

We come now to examine what is the precise nature of the Contagious Diseases Act of 1866. And to put our readers in possession of the facts, we think it best to give a copious summary of this remarkable enactment. The first three sections relate to the interpretation of terms, the fixing of time for commencement of operations, and the repeal of the previous enactment. The fourth defines the places wherein the Act is to operate; and the fifth directs the expenses of the Act to be defrayed by the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for War out of money to be provided by Parliament. Visiting surgeons and assistant-surgeons are to be appointed according to section 6, by the War Office or the Admiralty; and under section 7, inspectors and assistant-inspectors of certified hospitals are to be similarly appointed. Power to provide and certify hospitals is given in sections 8 and 9; and by subsequent sections the inspection of certified hospitals and power to withdraw certificates are arranged for. In section 12 the certification of hospitals is made to depend on 'adequate provision' being made for the 'moral and religious instruction' of the women detained there under this Act. Very adroitly, and with velvet skill is this, the first mention of the women, wrapped up with their moral and religious

instruction. Moral and religious improvement of women who, under this very Act, are treated like beasts in order to guarantee them clean for the future use of the fornicator! The management of certified hospitals is left, by section 14, in the hands of the hospital managers, subject to the approval of all their regulations by the Admiralty or War Office, as far as regards women authorised by this Act to be detained therein for medical treatment, or being therein under medical treatment for a contagious disease. It is not till we come to the 15th section that we reach the marrow of the Act of 1866; and, although this has been repealed, it will be well to reproduce this in conjunction with the next section verbatim:—

**'PERIODICAL MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.'**

'15. When an information on oath is laid before a justice by a superintendent of police, charging to the effect that the informant has good cause to believe that a woman therein named is a common prostitute, and either is resident within the limits of any place to which this Act applies, or, being resident within five miles of those limits, has, within fourteen days before the laying of the information, been within these limits for the purpose of prostitution, the justice may, if he thinks fit, issue a notice thereof, addressed to such woman, which notice the superintendent of police shall cause to be served on her.

'Provided that nothing in this Act contained shall apply or extend, in the case of Woolwich, to any woman who is not resident within one of the parishes of Woolwich, Plumstead, or Charlton.

'16. In either of the following cases, namely:—If the woman on whom such a notice is served appears herself, or by some person on her behalf, at the time and place appointed in the notice, or at some other time and place appointed by adjournment;

'If she does not so appear, and it is shown (on oath) to the justice present that the notice was served on her a reasonable time before the time appointed for her appearance, or that reasonable notice of such adjournment was given to her (as the case may be), the justice present, on oath being made before him substantiating the matter of the information to his satisfaction, may, if he thinks fit, order that the woman be subject to a periodical medical examination by the visiting surgeon for any period not exceeding one year, for the purpose of ascertaining at the time of each such examination whether she is affected with a contagious disease; and thereupon she shall be subject to such a periodical medical examination, and the order shall be a sufficient warrant for the visiting surgeon to conduct such examination accordingly.

'The order shall specify the time and place at which the woman shall attend for the first examination.

'The superintendent of police shall cause a copy of the order to be served on the woman.'

In section 17, any woman within the limits of the Act may voluntarily, by a submission in writing, signed by her in the presence of and attested by the superintendent of police, subject herself to a periodical medical examination for any period not exceeding one year. In the following section power is given to the War Office or the Admiralty to make regulations as to time, place, and manner of examination; and in section 19 the visiting surgeon is empowered to prescribe

times and places at which the examinee is required to attend again for examination. If any woman so examined proves to be 'affected with a contagious disease,' she is rendered liable, in section 20, to be detained in a certified hospital, subject and according to the provisions of this Act, at the choice of the visiting surgeon.

'21. Any woman, to whom any such certificate of the visiting surgeon relates, may, if she thinks fit, proceed to the certified hospital named in that certificate, and place herself there for medical treatment, but if, after the certificate is delivered to her, she neglects or refuses to do so, the superintendent of police, or a constable acting under his orders, shall apprehend her, and convey her with all practicable speed to that hospital, and place her there for medical treatment, and the certificate of the visiting surgeon shall be a sufficient authority to him for so doing.'

The detention in the hospital is made, by section 22, terminable by written order of the chief medical officer of the hospital; but by the next section the inspector of certified hospitals may, if expedient, direct the transfer of any detained woman from one hospital to another; and by section 24 the detention under any one certificate is limited to three months, unless the chief medical officer of the hospital and either the inspector of certified hospitals or the visiting surgeon for the place whence she came, conjointly certify that further detention is requisite, in which case the term may be extended for three months longer. Section 25 gives any woman in a hospital who considers herself well, power to appeal to a justice of the peace, who, 'if he is satisfied, upon reasonable evidence, that she is free from a contagious disease, shall discharge her from such hospital.' Section 26 places in legal custody every woman whilst being conveyed or transferred under this Act, even though it be from one jurisdiction to another. Section 27 entitles every woman, on discharge from the hospital, to be sent to the place of her residence, free of cost. The next clause, being a penal one, will be best quoted in full:—

'28. In the following cases, namely,—

'If any woman, subjected by order of a justice under this Act to periodical medical examination, at any time temporarily absents herself in order to avoid submitting herself to such examination, on any occasion on which she ought so to submit herself, or refuses or wilfully neglects to submit herself to such examination on any such occasion;

'If any woman authorised by this Act to be detained in a certified hospital for medical treatment, quits the hospital without being discharged therefrom by the chief medical officer thereof by writing under his hand (the proof whereof shall lie on the accused);

'If any woman authorised by this Act to be detained in a certified hospital for medical treatment, or any woman being in a certified hospital under medical treatment for a contagious disease, refuses or wilfully neglects, while in the hospital, to conform to the regulations thereof approved under this Act;

'Then, and in every such case, such woman shall be guilty of an offence against

this Act, and, on summary conviction, shall be liable to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, in the case of a first offence for any term not exceeding one month, and in the case of a second or any subsequent offence for any term not exceeding three months; and in the case of the offence of quitting the hospital without being discharged as aforesaid, the woman may be taken into custody, without warrant, by any constable.'

The 29th section enacts that imprisonment for the 'offence' of non-submittal to examination shall not free the woman from the liability to be examined under which she lay prior to the 'offence,' unless she be certified as sound; and the 30th section provides that imprisonment for the 'offence' of quitting a hospital without being discharged, or of refusing or neglecting while in a hospital to conform to the regulations, shall not free her from liability to return to the hospital, but that she shall be sent back to that place on expiry of her imprisonment unless she be certified as cured. The 31st section imposes penalty of imprisonment on any woman discharged uncured, who 'is afterwards in any place for the purpose of prostitution.' By the 32nd, every order subjecting a woman to examination is made to operate 'as long as and whenever, from time to time, the woman to whom it relates is resident within the limits of the place to which this Act applies wherein the order was made, or within five miles of these limits, but not in any case for a longer period than one year,' nor longer than she remains uncertified as cured. The next three sections profess to give 'Relief from Examination.' They provide that if any woman, not being under detention in a hospital, desires to be relieved from examination to which she had been subjected, she may apply in writing to a justice, who shall appoint time and place for hearing the application; and if then it be shown 'to the satisfaction of a justice' that the applicant has ceased to be a common prostitute, or if the applicant be bound in a recognisance, with or without sureties, as it may please the justice, for good behaviour during three months, she shall be relieved from examination, but such relief shall cease 'if at any time the woman is found in any public thoroughfare, street, or place for the purpose of prostitution, or otherwise conducts herself as a common prostitute,' within the limits of the Act's operation. Penalties for harbouring any woman believed, on 'reasonable cause,' to be a common prostitute affected with a contagious disease, are provided in section 36. The remaining sections regulate the form of procedure under the Act; amongst other things they provide, in section 37, that the justice's court in which proceedings are taken against or by a woman of this class shall, 'unless the woman so desires,' be a secret court with closed doors. In section 40 it is enacted that any document purporting to

be signed by any official, whether legal, medical, hospital, or police, shall be taken as genuine unless proved to be otherwise, proof of the otherwise being thrown on the unfortunate woman, who may thus actually be convicted with a piece of forged paper unless she is in a position to prove the forgery! The last section in the Act—No. 42—is intended to fortify any one putting this Act in motion against a woman from being inconvenienced by action-at-law in consequence. Thus no action may be brought against him except in the county where, and within three months after, the thing was done; nor shall the plaintiff succeed in the action if sufficient amends be made before the action is brought, or a sufficient sum paid into court after the action is brought, by or on behalf of the defendant. The equity prevailing in the breasts of the concocters of this law is illustrated by the provisions that if the plaintiff fails in the action, or is nonsuited, or drops it, the defendant shall have full costs, as between attorney and client, no discretion being given to the judge; but that if the plaintiff succeeds in the action the defendant shall pay no costs, unless the judge certifies his approbation of the action.

Such, in brief, is the nature of the Contagious Diseases Act of 1866. We will now see how far it is modified by the Amendment Act of last session. In this, power is given, in section 3, to the surgeon to detain the woman five days before examining her, if she is 'found by him to be in such a condition that he cannot properly examine her,' and if he 'has reasonable grounds for believing that she is affected with a contagious disease.' If the drunkenness of the woman was the cause of the difficulty, she may be detained for twenty-four hours in any usual lockup. Section 4 repeals section 15 of the previous Act, and in its place substitutes the following:—

'Where an information on oath is laid before a justice by a superintendent of police charging to the effect that the informant has good cause to believe that a woman therein named is a common prostitute, and either is resident within the limits of any place to which this Act applies, or, being resident within ten miles of those limits, or having no settled place of abode, has, within fourteen days before the laying of the information, either been within those limits for the purpose of prostitution, or been outside of those limits for the purposes of prostitution in the company of men resident within those limits, the justice may, if he thinks fit, issue a notice thereof addressed to such woman, which notice the superintendent of police shall cause to be served on her:

'Provided that nothing in the Contagious Diseases Act, 1866 to 1869, shall extend, in the case of Woolwich, to any woman who is not resident within the limits specified in the first schedule to this Act.'

'Section 15 of the principal Act is hereby repealed, and the foregoing enactment in this section is substituted for it; provided that all proceedings taken and acts done under the section hereby repealed shall, notwithstanding, remain of full effect, and shall, if necessary, be continued as if they had been taken and done under this section.'

The next section substitutes for the limit of five miles fixed in section 32 of the previous Act, an extension to ten miles. In section 6, a woman's voluntary submission to periodical examination is made to have all the effect of a justice's order, and to bring her within scope of all the penalties if she repents of her voluntary submission. The six months named in section 24 of the previous Act are extended to nine months in section 7 of the new Act; 'so, nevertheless, that any woman be not detained under one certificate for a longer time in the whole than nine months.' The final custody of orders of discharge is given, in section 8, to the superintendent of police. By section 9, a woman, not in a hospital, craving relief from examination, may apply to the visiting surgeon, who shall then communicate with the superintendent of police, who, if satisfied by the surgeon's report or other evidence that the applicant has ceased to be a common prostitute, shall have power to relieve from examination. This section, in connection with sections 33, 34, and 35 of the prior Act, gives the alternative of application for relief either to a justice or to the visiting surgeon. Section 10 substitutes a new schedule for the one defining the places to which the two Acts apply; and thereby extends the incidence of the provisions of the Act to the extra districts which we have already named. Section 11 provides new forms of certificates, orders, and other instruments, instead of those in the former Act. Carrying out these two changes, the 4th and 38th sections of the principal Act, and the two schedules to that Act, are repealed in section 12. A concluding section provides for the settlement of a child born of a woman whilst detained in a hospital.

Such being the provisions of this remarkable piece of legislation, we will now consider briefly some of the objections that may reasonably be brought against it.

A very rapid glance at this new law reveals its exceedingly one-sided character, as relates to the two sexes. All its artillery is pointed at the woman. The man, though equally dangerous to the public health, is let off scot free. But since the object of the law is to annihilate, as far as may be done, certain diseases, this is obviously defeated so long as only one sex is dealt with. In order to be efficient, it should subject the man to be examined as well as the woman; and it should do this, no less, in order to be equitable as between woman and man. A man who goes about infecting women is as dangerous as a woman infecting men. If the law provided that not only every woman but every man when suspected of prostitution, or found in the society of prostitutes, should be subjected to examination by force, and imprisoned

in hospital if found diseased, we should be able to recognise so far its fairness. We may be certain that had the female suffrage had its fair share in this legislation, men would not have been permitted to be thus monstrously unjust to the weaker sex. It is a man's enactment, and is, we are sorry to say, for its radical injustice, disgraceful to our own sex by which it was made law.

A second objection to it is, that it subjects women to the examination, not of a jury of matrons, nor of a medical practitioner of their own sex, but to that of a person or persons of the opposite sex. It thus gives forcible extension to the purely modern and very unfortunate and objectionable practice of man-midwifery. Future generations will lift up their hands in astonishment at the needless and barbarous indelicacy of their ancestors of the nineteenth century. They will affirm that men have no more fitness for treating the special diseases of women than women have for treating the special diseases of men. Evidently the impropriety is equal in both cases, and if women must be dragged out of the streets or their own houses to be submitted to a distressing and disgusting examination, the examiners should certainly be persons of their own sex.

A third objection to the new law is, that it must enormously increase the demand for hospital accommodation—a very serious matter to the public at large, by whom the money would require to be found. The Association for Promoting the Extension of the Contagious Diseases Acts to the Civil Population of the United Kingdom contends 'that sufferers under any kind of contagious disease are dangerous members of society, and should, so long as they are in this state, be prevented from communicating it to others ;' 'that common prostitutes should be subject to a compulsory medical examination and to compulsory detention in hospital as often as they are found diseased and as long as they continue so ;' and 'that for the reception of prostitutes suffering from venereal disease, hospital accommodation should be provided in all towns where such persons congregate.' Mr. Simon points out that the plan would require for London alone, if there be in it only half the prostitution and disease affirmed by the association to exist, the erection and maintenance of new hospital accommodation nearly equal to what is now given by the twelve general hospitals of London for all bodily diseases put together. The charge of maintaining such hospitals in London alone would probably be at least £100,000 per annum ; and their construction would probably represent a first cost little short of half a million of money. And besides this,

increased police arrangements would have to be paid for heavily, and the medical inspectors must be handsomely provided for. Mr. Simon very forcibly puts the difficulty of providing for such an expenditure:—

'Demands like the above are evidently not likely to be met by voluntary contributions. The result, if to be got at all, can only be got under action of law; and any such law, whether empowering the central Government to defray expenses out of proceeds of general taxation, or empowering municipalities to assign local funds for the purpose, is, of course, in relating to minorities, compulsory. Now, it is quite certain that, rightly or wrongly the proposed appropriation of money would, in the eyes of very large numbers of persons, be to the last degree odious and immoral. In most municipal constituencies, there are swarms of persons who already find it no easy matter to satisfy the collectors of rates and taxes; they would see the prostitute kept in the hospital at their expense for weeks or months, not necessarily from the exigencies of severe illness of her own, but essentially that she might be made clean for hire, lest any of her users should catch disease from her; they would remember in contrast that for themselves wonderfully little is done by authority to protect them against adulterations of food, or against false weights and measures; and they might regard it as a strange caprice of law which should oblige them to contribute to the cost of giving an artificial security to their neighbour's looseness of life. It seems to me very important to measure beforehand the degree in which such arguments would be valid, or rather to consider on what principles (if any) the proposed intervention of law is to be justified.'

We find in the pamphlets before us, many allusions to these contagious diseases as being God's punishment for sin, whence is argued the impropriety of attempting to prevent them. With this doctrine we are unable to agree. In the first place, it is obvious that if it were wrong to prevent, it would also be wrong to cure. If this were really the punishment which God provides for the sin of incontinence, the sinners condemned to it ought to be left to suffer under it till God releases them, and physicians would have no business to try to interfere with the amount or duration of the punishment. But none of those who call these diseases God's punishment for sin, object to endeavour to alleviate or cure them after they have been contracted. Their logic, therefore, is lame; and unless they are prepared to protest against curative measures, they have no right to object, on the ground of Divine punishment, against otherwise unobjectionable preventive ones.

In the second place, if these diseases were really God's punishment for this sin, then to attempt either to prevent or cure them by sanitary law or medical skill would be alike impertinent and vain. Stultification is not predictable of the Divine Providence, nor defeat of the Divine law. If it were true that these diseases are the penalties divinely inflicted on moral iniquity, it would not be wrong to interfere with their incidence, only because it would not be possible. Men must 'get up very early' to outwit God. When the Almighty appoints a punishment for sin, He looks after the infliction of that penalty;

He speaks, and it is done. In every case of transgression the punishment falls, and inevitably; but it falls upon the soul, not upon the body of the sinner. There it is that he receives within himself that reward of disobedience which is meet. Loss of mental purity, pollution of wish and thought, increased force of sinful propensity, consequent approximation of soul to infernal forms of existence, augmented difficulty in approaching heaven or in appreciating things heavenly,—these constitute, under different names, the only really divine punishment of sin. In the very act of moral transgression the sentence is pronounced, the sin is visited, the punishment falls; and this can no more be dodged or evaded than God can be mocked, or than a man can fail to be judged according to his works.

But physical disease is largely evitable, and offers a high premium to cleverness in avoiding it, as well as being susceptible, more or less, of physical cure. That it is no divine penalty for sin is evident from the fact that cunning can evade it. With certain precautions, infection is avoidable, and that, too, in cases wherein the guilt may be doubly heinous. The frequent and flagitious sinner may cleverly insure himself, whilst the alleged penalty, in its severest and most loathsome manifestations, may fall on a first and only transgression. The disease comes, a consequence of not knowing, or of carelessly rejecting, feasible physical precautions. If we be still more desperately wicked than the common fornicator; 'having waste ground enough' with him, if we be so far evil beyond him as to 'raise the sanctuary and pitch our evils there,' we may even altogether escape in still more wicked seduction the morbid liabilities of wicked prostitution. This alleged penalty may even impinge on the most careful and the most innocent, through the folly of progenitors, or the untoward accidents of medical practice, or of unhappy matrimonial relationship. These diseases come as scarlet fever or as small pox comes, because the physical laws of health have been violated, first in those amongst whose filth the disease originated, and subsequently in persons to whom the infection, with or without fault of theirs, may have been accidentally conveyed. A blind undiscriminating penalty like this, that goes blundering about, hit or miss, that hurts the innocent and that can be made a fool of by the guilty, has in it none of the characteristics of Divine retribution.

We do not affirm that there is therefore no connection between these diseases and the penalty of sin. What has been taught from very ancient times, that the entrance and increase of physical disease in the world has some inherent relationship with sin as its occult cause, is not proved to be

untrue. The fact is, although these diseases are not the real penalties of lechery, they are yet vivid pictures of that real penalty, painted on skin and in flesh and blood. Rightly regarded, a wretched creature, deeply tainted, half eaten up by the sores and rottenness of syphilis, is God's occasional and physical picture to warn us of what ravages a certain sin actually and invariably works in the human spirit when, by long and unrepented practice, we make it inveterate. Just so is its hideous aspect to all discerners of spirits. Just as deplorable a spectacle, sore for sore, corruption for corruption, is the voluptuary's soul in the sight of the angels and of God.

The case indeed is similar with all sorts of diseases. They are occasional warning pictures of the various maladies of the human spirit, in its different degrees of departure from sanity and God. They come, not in retribution of this or that man's sin, or his parents', but that the power of God (in its retributive action on all sinning souls) may be made (bodily) manifest (or be pictured forth) in him. Hence in the Gospels the display of power to heal physical disease is said to be exercised 'that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power to forgive sins ;'—that is, in healing the sick spirit, just as that effect is depicted in healing the sick body. But if the occurrence of the physical malady had been made to be not occasional, but necessarily coincident with that of the spiritual disease, the physical would have lost its character as mere picture, and would have become indistinguishable from the real penalty in the morbid soul. There are other and deeper reasons, besides, for the divorce which we see in this merely probational life, between the occurrence of the physical pictures of God's penalties and the commission of the sins upon which the real spiritual penalties are visited. If, for instance, moral transgression invariably brought its physical punishment, it would cease, for men would be too much terrified to offend. But the virtue thus superinduced would be a virtue of fright, of compulsion, not of free will—not genuine, therefore, and therefore hateful in God's sight, because insincere. Men with hereditary tendencies to evil, and in a probationary state, must be left free to sin if they are to be left free to learn to hate sin and to love purity indeed. And so the incidence of what would otherwise be the physical penalty of sin is dislocated and rendered occasional, and as it were accidental, lest fear of God should defeat the love of Him, and a universally well-founded dread of the physical consequences of vice should make the return of fallen humanity to unadulterated virtue impossible. And whilst we thus account for the evident divorce existing

between the evil diseases that often accompany incontinence and the Divine punishment of that sin, of which they are yet the terrible and admonitory pictures, we ground upon it the right of the sanitary reformer to abate, or even, if he can, to abolish these or any other physical diseases. For whatever may have been the occult connection between the first outbreak of diseases and the sins whose consequences they so vividly pourtray, yet the physical evil, once generated, is self-propagating, extends itself blindly far and wide, may be spread by accidental causes into innocent families, can be immensely augmented by carelessness or ignorance, is susceptible of alleviation, diminution, and cure by medical art, and ought, for pity's sake, to be encountered and checked by every laudable effort of the physician. But whilst we are thus careful to disembarass the question of a self-contradictory element, and to give fair play to that side of the debate which, as we conceive, justly vindicates the right of the sanitary reformer to adopt every justifiable measure to abate and destroy physical disease, we still claim our own right to reserve judgment in other respects on the justifiableness of any particular measure. For if it is possible that, bad as the disease is, the remedy may be worse, then, of course, it is highly necessary to weigh the character of every proposed remedy. It is here that we again join hands with the opponents of the new legislation, and proceed to allude to further reasons against its continuance.

One such reason is found in the evident inefficiency of the new law. As we have said, it only deals with fornicators of the less numerous sex ; the more numerous remain uninspected and free to extend disease beyond all possible reach of legislative control. And when it has done all it can with the one sex, there will yet remain many of them who, evading its hateful provisions, will remain to be prolific sources of the distemper. In other cases compliance with the law in every respect will fail to lead to the discovery of existing disease, and that especially in the worst cases. For, whilst it may be tending to lessen the occurrence of the less serious forms of disease, the system confessedly fails most with the most virulent, these, in their earlier stages, being always least susceptible, and often not admissive, of discovery. It should be known that under the name of syphilis are commonly confounded several distinct diseases ; whilst it is only true syphilis that is so terrible in its results as to have any *prima facie* claim to extraordinary or special legislation. The less serious complaints incident to incontinence are probably (on the whole) of no little service to society, by their power to admonish and deter. For although no amount of

fear could ever produce virtue in the least degree, yet fear can and does conduce notably to the welfare of society by the useful restraints that it inauguates. Dread of the law cannot make a man honest, but it can and often does prevent both him from stealing and from being therefore punished at society's cost, and some one else from suffering the loss of what he would steal. And fear of acquiring disease in incontinence fulfils an equally useful part in society, not indeed by purifying the thoughts and heart, but yet by preventing much disturbance and distress, the interruption or defeat of many serviceable relationships, and the breaking up of many homes. To God, whose end is man's restoration to inward virtue and holiness, it has not seemed worth while to attach physical suffering so invariably to sin that sinning should become impossible, and the acquisition of true virtue be thereby put out of man's reach. But to men, as regards their temporal interests, and the outward peace and good order of society, it may be and is both worth their while and highly important that fear should operate largely to check the outward manifestations of sinful desires. This is why we supplement the punishments of Him who says—'Vengeance is mine, I will repay,' with our social laws. For the sake, not of real virtue, but of social order and external peace, it is well that these deterrent diseases should be suffered to exist. If their occurrence were invariably coincident with the sin, and their severity were necessarily on the same scale with the enormity of the sin in which they were incurred, one might even be inclined to vote sternly against medical aid to such sufferers, and that, not for virtue's sake, but in the cause of the temporal welfare of society. But since the gravity of each case medically is in no necessary proportion to the offender's degree of guilt, pity for the sufferer rightly supersedes that stern regard for the general welfare, whereby otherwise it might be over-ridden. This pity, moreover, cannot, of course, tolerate any violence done to the sufferers, much less the commission of any base outrage upon them. Nor can it consistently invoke the aid of the law in order to utterly suppress diseases on whose existence pity for society at large has now reason to congratulate itself.

Another serious objection to this legislation is in the power to mar the reputation of any woman that it gives to the most rash, or even to the basest of men, and to subject her to physical outrage. 'It is found that, under the 17th section of the Act, practised police spies can bully, cajole, and terrify comparatively innocent, ay, and entirely innocent girls, into enrolling themselves in the ranks of registered prostitutes.

It is in evidence before the Parliamentary Commission that already in free England respectable married women, and at least one virgin, have been thus grossly violated.' 'One of the darkest features of the Act is the power of denunciation which, by it, is placed in the hands of brothel-keepers, procuresses, jealous companions, chagrined swains, anonymous correspondents, and others belonging to a similar lying and slanderous class. Already it is in evidence that respectable women have been denounced out of spite, and that for similar reasons drunken soldiers have accused innocent women of communicating disease—innocence only proved, however, after the grossest outrage.' 'I would appeal,' says Mr. Robert Charleton, 'to the *manly* feelings of my fellow-countrymen, and call their attention to the *cowardice*, no less than to the flagrant injustice of a law which allows the *male* offender to pursue his course without molestation, and reserves all its penalties for the *weaker sex*; which leaves the adulterer, the fornicator, the debauchee, in the unrebuked indulgence of his brutal lust, whilst on the *victim* of that lust it heaps all the horrible indignities which lie concealed under the smoothly sounding term, "compulsory medical examination." ' As we have seen, any superintendent of police, on the information of any reprobate, may inform on oath against any innocent woman who, being resident within ten miles of one of the scheduled districts, has once visited it, or who, residing at whatever distance, has been visited by some male inhabitant of it; and everything then depends on the private discretion of a single justice, who may himself have instigated or may connive at the movement, for some revengeful or otherwise evil purpose of his own. Thenceforward the woman is ticketed as a prostitute, and subjected to periodical examinations which she can only avoid by absconding to some distant region, whence she is liable to be dragged back and imprisoned, or by gaining the good opinion and kind offices of the surgeon who examines her, or of a justice of the peace. And, if at all efficient, what an examination this is! No mere cursory glance of the eye, but the manual application of a tube which may, and, where the system is in full operation, most probably will be still warm from use in the body of some other victim.\* The necessary rapidity with which large numbers of women are successively inspected where these Acts are in force renders highly probable the communication of infection from one to

\* It consists in the forcible inspection of the interior of the female body by means of an instrument, in the presence of men in a room set apart and known for the purpose of such inspection, taking place with the knowledge of policemen and other hangers-on of a police-office.—*Mr. T. Worth.*

another in the horrible process; and thus the very means taken to restrict the disease may be the fertile cause of its extension.

But still more alarming is the prospect held out by these Acts, of a lowering of the moral tone of society at large, in relation to incontinence. 'Nowhere,' says Dr. Guthrie, 'are domestic purity and female innocence less secure than in those cities and countries where this continental system is in full force. The subject is one to which my attention has been carefully and painfully turned, and I have found that seduction is nowhere so common as in those cities where the evil you seek to eradicate is made a matter of police regulations.' Professor Newman in his pamphlet justly lays much stress on this aspect of the question. It is, indeed, obvious that when the State undertakes to guard the health of prostitutes and to make vice more safe, it is felt to be virtually sanctioning the occupation of the women, and to be conniving at their prostitution. Short of prosecution and suppression, its only allowable attitude is entire abstention from noticing the existence of such depravity. Anything more favourable than this, involves promotion of the evil practice, and virtual implication in its guilt. The time will come—a happier day than ours—when the moral tone of society will be so much improved as not only to tolerate but imperatively to call for the suppression of vice by every available implement that the State can take into its hands. But with the Contagious Diseases Acts it takes a deeply retrograde step, and lends sanction and aid to that upon which it ought to fix its severest frown.

We should not find it possible within our limits, if it were desirable, to go over the whole ground requisite to be traversed in a thorough investigation of this question. The case is so well put by Mr. Simon that we are content to refer our readers to his argument; and where that fails to satisfy them, there will still remain Mr. F. W. Newman's very powerfully-written pamphlet. Our object in the present paper is chiefly to call the attention of our readers to the very important innovation that has recently been made, and especially to protest against it, on the grounds of its danger in lowering the moral tone of the community—of its cowardly baseness in thundering penalties against the most helpless sex whilst leaving the other untouched,—and of the monstrous power it places in the hands of any policeman, common informer, discarded suitor, or would-be oppressor of innocence, to intimidate and terrify, and gain his atrocious ends by threatening to inflict base and intolerable indignities even on the innocent and the pure. In fact, there is no lady in the land who, if

devoid of protectors well able to defend her, might not be dragged by this infamous law into the presence of a corrupt-minded surgeon, at the instance of any miscreant, and subjected to the horrors of periodical examination, and permanent loss of character. Our sisters, our wives, our mothers are not safe, except in as far as those who can put the Act in operation choose to let them remain so. We alluded early in our article to the excited tone of some of the denouncers of this legislation : but really, if we write much further, we ourselves shall be in danger of screaming. We will conclude at once, simply adding the expression of our confident opinion that the British public, when once informed of the real nature of the Contagious Diseases Acts, will cry out in thunder for their repeal.

---

#### UNDERGROUND LIFE.

1. *Underground Life; or, Mines and Miners.* By L. Simonin. Translated and adapted to the present state of British Mining, and edited by H. W. Bristow, F.R.S. London : Chapman & Hall. 1869.
2. *Mineral Statistics of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland for the year 1868.* With an Appendix by Robert Hunt, F.R.S. London : Longmans.

THE 'absolute total value of the metals and coal, with other minerals (not including slates, lime, building stones, or common clays), produced in 1868 was £43,525,524.' That is to say, for every working day of the year there is raised mineral produce to the value of about £140,000. This is the worth of the minerals at the place where they are raised. Nearly the whole of it has to be carried for shorter or longer distances by sea or by rail. The weight of these minerals is nearly 120,000,000 tons. From these figures we may form some idea of the immense importance which our mineral wealth is to us, of the prominent part which 'underground life' plays in the life of the nation. The mere money value of our minerals would give a very imperfect notion. If the United Kingdom were, like its antipodal colonies, a gold-producing country, a small yield would give a large value. But as the total quantity of gold quartz raised here was worth but £1,000, and even that of silver only £222,773, it is manifest that a large amount of labour must have been expended in raising the 43½ millions' worth of minerals mentioned above, and

that the distribution of them must have led to an extensive circulation of money. We have spoken of the United Kingdom. But that country contains only a small proportion of the mineral wealth of the whole world. It has been estimated that in our own country there are eighty thousand million tons of coal. The coal fields of Westphalia contain about half of this quantity. Russia possesses immense carboniferous deposits stretching from the White Sea to the Sea of Azof, and along the Ural, hitherto little worked, but whose value Peter the Great was shrewd enough to see, declaring ‘these mines will make the fortunes of our children.’ Belgium undoubtedly owes much of her prosperity to the coal fields which surround Liège. In France the department of Gard alone yields 1,200,000 tons a year, and is exceeded by those of the Loire and the Nord. The total yield of France is however only one-ninth of that of England, about 12,000,000 tons. We know as yet little of the products of Africa, but Abyssinia and Madagascar certainly contain coal. More than two-thirds of the whole area of China is occupied by coal-bearing strata. There is coal in Japan; unfortunately there is little that is of much use in India; but the precious fuel has been discovered in Western Australia. Greenland contains large stores of coal, but it lies under the ice, and would therefore be awkward to work. There is coal in Chili and in British North America. But the largest coal field in the world is in the United States. It covers an area eight times larger than all the rest put together. It is the great reserve for future ages. It affords the almost certain proof that henceforth as hitherto the ‘course of empire’ will still ‘westward take its way.’

The rapidly increasing consumption of coal in this country has lately caused some anxiety both to our statists and our statesmen. Mr. Stanley Jevons affirmed that if we continued our present rate of increase we should exhaust our supply in about a century. Mr. Gladstone made this formidable contingency an argument for attempting to reduce the national debt. But that is no reason why the increase should continue. A large amount of the consumption is absolute waste. Englishmen consume three tons per head per annum, while France consumes less than half a ton. True, in France, wood is much used for fuel; but even taking that consideration into account, there is ample room for reduction in English consumption. There is really no reason why we need fear that we shall perish from cold, though it is quite possible that as our workings become deeper and therefore more costly to work, we may find it cheaper to import our coal from the United States. At present that country raises only 15,000,000 tons of the 170,000,000 raised throughout the world; only about one-seventh of the quantity raised by England alone. It may be said that to change the position of the two countries with regard to this all-important produce is to transfer the primacy of nations from ourselves to our quondam-colonists. This is undoubtedly true, and as certainly unavoidable unless some fresh source of heat, light, and power can be discovered. It is highly probable that this will be accomplished. It was when our ancestors were lamenting over the

destruction of our forests, and asking where they should find fuel to smelt their iron, that coal was found to possess the needful qualities. Necessity is the mother of invention, and in our strait we shall find some means of escape. Coal after all is petrified sunbeams ; for it was the solar heat that fixed the carbon in the plants which formed the coal millions of years ago, and the heat absorbed in doing that work is now liberated to raise steam : or, as Robert Stephenson well said, ‘locomotive engines are only the horses of the sun.’ M. Simonin, or his translator (it is the only fault in their book that we can never tell which of the two is speaking), believes that we must aim to discover how to utilise and condense the vast heat of the sun which is now lost. We must learn to ‘bottle sunbeams.’ The most recent discoveries with regard to heat support that idea. ‘The sun is the combustible of the future ; and the torrid regions, which are now nearly desert, may perhaps some day witness a migration of civilised people in a mass in that direction, like the incursions of the barbarians into Europe in former times.’

The Romans knew nothing of the value of coal. Roman emperors cut their aqueducts through the carboniferous strata, but took no notice of that which, had its properties been known, might have saved the empire. The Chinese were better informed than the Romans. They used coal in the baking of their porcelain, and even collected the inflammable gases which exude spontaneously from coal, and used them for illumination. They sank a borer in the ground and conveyed the gas in pipes to the place where it was wanted. They worked their coal mines in a very primitive fashion. No care was taken to support the underground ways, or to provide a proper outlet for the water, or to avoid explosions of fire-damp. As M. Simonin well remarks in his splendid volume, ‘the Chinese have remained in this primitive state in working their mines up to the present time, and it was scarcely worth while to begin so early if so little progress was made.’ There are indications that coal was worked in Ancient Britain, for—not to quote other evidence—coal has been found in ancient workings in Derbyshire and among the ruins of the Roman Uriconium, the modern Wroxeter. In 1259, Henry III. granted a charter to the freemen of Newcastle by which they obtained liberty to ‘dig for cole,’ and subsequently we read of ‘sea-cole’ being carried to London. There were coal mines in Scotland and Wales before those countries were brought under English rule. In 1615, 4,000 vessels were employed in carrying coal to the continent and bringing back corn. In 1619, Dud Dudley obtained a patent from King James for using coal in the smelting of iron ore. After many failures, he succeeded, and established in South Staffordshire the use of coal in the manufacture of iron. ‘From this period,’ says Mr. Bristow, ‘may be dated that activity in coal mining which has distinguished Great Britain beyond any other country.’ Belgium began to work its coal mines about the same time as England. There is an interesting legend in connection with the first workings in the former country. A certain farrier of Plénevaux, Houillous by name, found it impossible to earn enough to keep his family from starvation. It was the

dearness of charcoal that troubled him. He was on the point of committing suicide, when a white-bearded man entered the shop. To him Houillot told his troubles. The old man was moved to tears, and said to the farrier, 'Go to the high burning mountain, dig up the ground, and you will find veins of a black earth suitable for the forge.' Houillot went to the spot, found the earth, placed it on the fire, and forged a horse-shoe at one heating. He did not keep his discovery to himself, but told all his neighbours. A grateful posterity has preserved his memory by giving his name to coal (in French *houille*), and he is still spoken of with gratitude by the miners of Liège.

In dealing with the forces of nature, we find constant action and reaction. A century ago the coal mines of Northumberland were flooded. They must be cleared of water before the coal could be raised. Up to that time nothing had been done to improve the old pump, and that was altogether insufficient. At the other extremity of England, not far from the Land's End, in the copper mines of the Breage and Wendron district, a 'fire engine,' invented by Captain Savery, was clearing away the intruding water. A little later, Newcomen, of Dartmouth, improved upon Savery's invention. His 'fire-pump' was applied to the Newcastle mines, and so water plus coal, that is steam, was made to raise water. A little later the same media were used for a further purpose. Water plus coal was made to raise coal. Then a further development took place. In order to transport more readily this heavy, bulky mineral, rails were used in coal and iron mines, and so water plus coal plus iron were made to raise iron. The combination of forces by no means ends here. Coal is used to smelt the ore which it has helped to raise. Swansea, a little while ago an almost unknown town, is now the copper-smelting centre of the world. South Wales produces 8,000,000 tons of coal annually; the Newcastle district thrice that amount, double the whole supply of France. Ireland contributes but a fractional proportion of our yield—only about 120,000 tons out of 100,000,000. How different would be the condition of that country if the figures were otherwise. Political discontent would not survive the discovery of a coal-field. As it is, a large portion of Ireland has, in lieu of coal, only peat. Both substances are the same element in different stages: both are carbon; but while the diamond stands first in the eight stages of that base, and coal of various sorts occupies the third, fourth, and fifth stages, peat holds the lowest place. Hence it is that, while there are wide tracts of Ireland uninhabited or tenanted by a race of paupers in a chronic state of discontent, Lancashire, Yorkshire, Staffordshire, and Wales are covered by towns of rapidly-increasing population, seamed by railways and canals, inhabited by thoroughly loyal, because contented and prosperous people.

Coal being thus a source of individual wealth and national contentment, its acquisition has always been eagerly sought. Large sums have been spent in searching for the precious mineral, often without result. A knowledge of geology is, of course, one of the most important aids to discovery. Sometimes even geology leads

astray. For instance, M. Simonin relates that the coal measures in the neighbourhood of Valenciennes having been suddenly deflected, instead of continuing in a straight line, years of fruitless effort were spent in following the missing stratum, and at last it was discovered only by accident. On the other hand, during a search for Artesian springs in the Pas-de-Calais, the borer unexpectedly revealed the presence of coal measures beneath the cretaceous strata.

'Scarcely was the news made known than everybody set to work, and the tool was no longer used to search for water, but for coal. So many borings were immediately made, over a length of about 20 leagues, and an average breadth of four, that the ground was pierced like a colander by a series of borings all accurately laid down on a plan drawn to a tolerably large scale, reminding one of the constellations of stars as they are figured on celestial charts. Success exceeded all hopes. The subterranean beds of watery ground (called *torrents*), which are so abundant in these districts, caused the most various obstacles to the miners; but they ultimately succeeded in overcoming all impediments. The mineral wealth of France became augmented by a hundred thousand acres of coal fields. Twenty-seven companies were formed to work the new concessions. Some forty pits have been sunk through, on an average from 109 to 164 yards of overlying ground, to depths varying from 197 to 328 yards, one pit, that of Ferfay, having its workings at the depth of 503 yards. In 15 years the produce of this basin has steadily increased from less than 5,000 tons in 1851 to 80,000 tons in 1854, while it attained upwards of 1,600,000 tons in 1866, a tenth of the entire produce of France. And all this originated in a search for water!'—('Underground Life,' p. 74.)

When the allies revised the frontiers of France in 1815, they thought it prudent to draw the line so as to exclude the rich coal basin of Saarbrück. They felt certain that if coal existed on the other side of the boundary, it would be at such a depth that it could not be worked. But the French inhabitants of the Moselle district were determined to defeat the kind intentions of their conquerors, and set to work with amazing energy in boring holes and sinking pits. The constant flooding of the works gave them a vast amount of trouble, and caused a more serious expense. When the original capital was exhausted without result, fresh funds were subscribed, and at length, at the opening of the French Chambers in 1858, Napoleon announced that these 43 years' efforts had been rewarded with success, and he proclaimed the discovery of the Moselle coal basin. The greatest depth to which boring has ever been carried is that commenced by Mr. E. Schneider, near Creuzot. It was carried down a distance of 3,020 feet, and then was stopped by an unprecedented accident. The borer broke, and although Herr Kind, the most celebrated boring engineer of the day, was called in, he found himself quite unable to extract the broken chisel. The work had, therefore, to be abandoned, to the intense regret of the neighbouring population. It is by no means certain that there is not coal under London; but, if it does exist there, it must be at a depth far below the 4,000 feet which Mr. Hull has fixed as the limit of profitable working. Hereafter, probably, means will be devised for reaching deep coal at a much smaller expense than is now necessary. When that time comes, it will be for Government to consider if it should not undertake the task of boring, which would

be far too costly for private persons to attempt. The preliminary expenses of opening a coal mine are very great. Frequently the sinking of the necessary shafts and the furnishing them with tackle costs £80,000. In one case, that of a coal mine in Durham, £100,000 was spent upon one shaft. If there seems no limit to the expense, so likewise is there none to the ingenuity displayed in mining. In the coal fields of the Lower Loire, it became necessary to sink through submerged sand, and to establish the shaft in the very bed of the river. To pump water out from such a soil as this was as hopeless a task as that laid upon the Cornish Giant Tregeagle, when he had to empty Dosmary Pool with a pierced limpet shell. M. Triger sank iron cylinders, excavated from them the sand and stones, divided the apparatus into three air-tight compartments, forced compressed air in the lower one, and enclosed the workmen in that, as in a diving-bell. The compressed air being carried against the bottom of the shaft, prevented the water from rising. 'Imagine an army of mice,' said M. Triger to M. Simonin, 'and a cat suddenly to make her appearance, you would have the picture of the water reaching the bottom of one shaft by a thousand holes in the ground if the pressure of the air is lowered, and returning suddenly to the sands as soon as the air recovers its tension.' The rubbish and running sands are removed in buckets. Trapdoors communicate from one stage to the other, and so an approach to an atmospheric equilibrium is maintained. Most of the workmen carry on their operations in the compressed atmosphere with as much ease as in the open air. Two classes of men are exceptions—those who have the drum of the ear very delicate, and those given to the use of strong drinks. Some workmen actually derive comfort from an air thus made rich in oxygen. The ability to whistle is lost in it, but the deaf recover their hearing for a time, and lamps burn in it with greater brilliance. This application of compressed air was used in building the Royal Albert Bridge, which spans the Tamar between Devon and Cornwall, and also in building the bridge across the Medway at Rochester, and that across the Rhine at Kehl.

A coal mine which has been worked for any considerable period is well worth visiting. In many of the continental mines it is usual to offer prayers before the miners descend; and even where this is not done, they cross themselves, and whisper an invocation to the Virgin, or to Saint Barbe, the great patron of miners. A stranger descending the shaft for the first time is apt to crouch down in the cage, fearing a collision. The miners, having learnt confidence by experience, often descend in a manner that seems utterly reckless. Arrived at the bottom, galleries are seen stretching out in all directions. Some are wide, long, and high, and form the principal streets of the mine. Others are low, narrow, tortuous, ill-ventilated, and in bad repair, suggesting the back alleys of a large city. This underground town is inhabited night and day, for the miners relieve each other in shifts of eight hours each. It is furrowed by railways, upon which trucks of coal are constantly running. Sometimes the roof is so low that the trucks have to be drawn or propelled by men. But

horses are largely used, and these, when they have once descended, rarely see the light again; nevertheless, they thrive and grow fat. The galleries are so numerous and intricate that it is absolutely necessary to have maps of them. These are obtained by means of the graphometer, the theodolite, and the chain. It is of the highest importance that the maps should be accurate. Sometimes a level is driven from several points at once, and should a trifling deviation be made from the proper line, there will be an imperfect junction. The miners are so fully aware of this fact, that they are always on the look-out to prevent what they would consider a serious calamity. They not only adhere faithfully to the orders that are given them, but before meeting they knock with the pick and hammer, and judge by the way in which the sound is transmitted through the solid ground between them, whether the two working places are in the right direction for meeting. Upon the accuracy of the surveyor depend important rights of property. If he blunders, one coalowner may seriously encroach upon the land of another, and so open the door to future litigation. The plan and its accompanying sections shew also the various levels, the dip of the seam, the chances of infiltration of water-courses, the amount of coal which ought to be left as a wall to separate old from new workings, and one property from another. The plan, in fact, is an exact copy of the mine, and reveals its condition as truly as though the eye could see at a glance all the different levels. It is for this reason that coalowners are often indisposed to show their plans to visitors.

The pitman's life is a battle with the four 'elements,' to retain our old schoolday phraseology.

'Fire menaces him in blasting, in the firing of the coal and in explosions of fire-damp; the air, by becoming rarefied, or mixed with mephitic or explosive vapours; the earth, in falls of roofs, &c.; the water, by inundations. The collier opposes to all these (often invisible) enemies, the calm stoicism, the approved courage, and the practical science which tend to make the brave and skilled miner. And the underground soldier is the more meritorious, in that he is encouraged neither by the certainty of advancement, nor by the hope of honourable recompense in this contest in which he risks his life at every moment. He has only the satisfaction of observing discipline, and of faithfully doing his duty.'—('Underground Life,' p. 146.)

The blasting of coal gives rise to many accidents, which, however, are often due proximately to the carelessness of the miners. Spontaneous combustion is more formidable, because less under control. It is produced by the heating of the small coal, from the decomposition of the iron pyrites which the coal contains in contact with moisture. When the small coal of certain seams is left in the mine it speedily undergoes this chemical decomposition. It is accompanied by a great development of heat. The coal soon ignites, and the fire, finding in the coal seam a natural aliment, spreads rapidly through the mine. In such cases dams of clay are built up to isolate the conflagration, which, being deprived of atmospheric air soon goes out. If the fire is only a slight one, the use of steam and of carbonic acid is sometimes adopted to extinguish it. The recently

invented *extincteur* is also successful in attaining the same result. But if the conflagration is serious, there is no alternative to the dams. Erecting these is one of the most trying tasks that the miner has to perform. He is compelled to remain in an impure air of very high temperature, and has to hold under the nostrils and over the mouth rag soaked in lime water or ammonia in order to neutralise the mephitic vapours, which otherwise would render him insensible. In some cases the fire will not yield to any exertions, and it is necessary to close up the mouth of the shaft. There is one mine in England where a fire is still raging after many years. A last resource is to flood the mine, and in one instance, near Charleroy, it was found necessary to turn the river Sambre into the raging underground furnace. There was formerly a coal mine on fire near Dudley. The effect was visible on the surface. The snow melted as soon as it touched the ground. The gardens yielded three crops a year, and a constant spring prevailed. In another district of Staffordshire a similar phenomenon was observed, and the inhabitants determined to establish a tropical garden on the spot. They imported colonial plants at a heavy expense, and for a time cultivated them successfully in the open-air conservatory. One day the fire went out, the soil resumed by degrees its natural temperature, and the plants died. But these underground fires are almost harmless when compared with fire-damp. This foe of the miners is vividly described by M. Simonin, and an accompanying illustration gives some idea of the fearful nature of the ruin which is wrought by it:—

'The moment the mixed gas comes in contact with the flame of a lamp a tremendous explosion takes place, resulting from the combination of the components of the fire-damp, hydrogen and carbon, with the oxygen of the air. The two former separate to combine with the oxygen, with which they have the greatest affinity. The double phenomenon only takes place at a high temperature; without flame it would not arise. The reaction produces an effect like the most brilliant lightning, and makes itself heard by a clap of thunder. The explosion spreads instantly into all the galleries of the mines, a roaring whirlwind of flaming air destroys everything it encounters, overthrowing trains and brattices and trap-doors, mounts into the shaft, and lifts from its foundation the staging which covers its mouth, through which it discharges thick clouds of coal, stone, and timber. The men are blinded, thrown down, scorched, and sometimes burnt to a cinder; often their clothes take fire, and not unfrequently they are buried beneath the ruins of the fallen roofs. When an attempt is made to fly to their assistance, there is not time to rescue them: there are only corpses left, which are scarcely recognisable. . . . The air doors are thrown down, the ventilation of the mine is reversed, the underground atmosphere is vitiated by the combustion of the fire-damp, and the stalls are filled with steam and carbonic acid. Sometimes the temperature rises so much that the coal is converted into coke at the sides of the galleries, and the commotion is so great that the dams have to withstand both fire and water, and the wallings raised to resist the thrust of the measures are themselves overthrown. Then to a scene of already indescribable desolation are added the horrors of inundation, falls of the ground and fire, when the explosion has already made only too many victims.'—('Underground Life,' p. 157.)

Before the invention of the safety-lamp, it used to be the custom in some continental mines to light the fire-damp every night, in order that it might not accumulate to a dangerous extent. To do

this was a perilous task, and many a time he who performed it never returned. He was called the *cannonier*, and if he fell a victim to the fire-damp, it was said that he had died at his post, and on the field of honour. In other mines he was called a penitent, on account of the resemblance of his dress to that of certain religious orders. Wrapped in a covering of wool or leather, the face protected by a mask, and the head enveloped in a hood like a monk's cowl, he crawled on the ground to keep himself in the layer of good air. In one hand he held a long stick, with a lighted candle fixed at the end of it, and he went alone lost in this poisonous maze, causing explosions by advancing his lamp, and thus decomposing the noxious gases. Returning he walked upright, for the fire-damp had, by combustion, been changed into carbonic acid, which, being heavier than the air, fell to the bottom. Davy's discovery led to the abolition of the 'penitent' or 'cannonier,' and to the saving of innumerable lives. Indeed it would have been impossible for our coal trade ever to have reached its present enormous dimensions but for this discovery, and its subsequent application in the invention of the safety lamp. The discovery arose in this wise. Davy was engaged on a series of researches on flame, and he noticed that small metal rings reduced the size and the illuminating power of flame. By reducing the size of the rings he found that the passage of the flame was entirely prevented, and that a gauge composed of very fine metal wire would not allow the flame to pass through. All the heat of the combustion is expended in raising the temperature of the metal, which is a good conductor of heat, and the flame does not retain heat enough to burn on the outside of the gauze. The explosive gas would pass through the wire gauze and be exploded at the flame within it; but the ignited gas could not pass back through the gauze, and hence could not communicate with or explode the gas on the outside. The many explosions which took place in coal mines about the year 1815, induced Davy to apply this discovery by the invention of his safety-lamp. George Stephenson made a similar invention almost simultaneously, and, indeed, claimed a priority over Davy. But at a meeting of coal-owners it was decided that the honour of the discovery belonged originally to the Cornishman. The two first Davy lamps used in a colliery are now preserved in the museum of practical geology, in London. Doubtless they are a trophy of more lives saved than the Belgian lion at Waterloo is of lives lost. Doubtless, too, most of the explosions which have taken place since this discovery are due to the recklessness of the miners who, rather than forego the pleasure of the pipe, will expose themselves and hundreds of their comrades to the risk of a terrible death. Only less useful, because less frequently used than the safety lamp, are the various apparatuses which have been devised for supplying miners with a store of fresh air. M. Rouquayrol's invention consists of a reservoir of sheet-iron, made strong enough to resist the pressure of from 25 to 40 atmospheres, and which is filled with compressed air forced into it by pumps. The reservoir is fastened on the miner's back, as

a soldier's knapsack, and a pipe passes from the reservoir into the mouth of the wearer. By a contrivance, consisting of a kind of bellows, the air is made to enter the lungs at only the ordinary pressure. The nostrils are closed by a spring. This invention will enable a man to breathe under water.

Fire and air are more dangerous and destructive than earth and water, because less easy to guard against, and less easy to combat when they have made an attack. When an explosion takes place there is small chance of saving the inmates of the mine; but when the ground gives way it is sometimes possible to dig through the ruins and extract the prisoners; or when a mine is flooded it is often possible to pump out the water sufficiently to rescue the men, who in the meanwhile have taken refuge in one of the higher levels. These deliverances are generally terribly exciting. They are a race with death. The prisoners can do nothing for themselves, but have to wait in silence, darkness, and hunger, the approach of their liberators. These work with super-human strength and energy; and M. Simonin mentions an instance in which a thickness of coal was dug through in 70 hours that under ordinary circumstances would have required a month. The same writer tells a series of the most stirring adventures which there is no space for us to repeat in full. In one instance miners who had been overtaken by a sudden inundation, and had taken refuge in an old working, were rescued alive after 13 days' imprisonment. The temperature, and the pressure and the composition of the air were favourable to life. Moreover they had the means of quenching their thirst. To assuage their hunger they first devoured their leather belts, and then ate the rotten wood of the struts. Even the place of refuge to which they had fled seemed at one time likely to fail them. The water rose until it wetted their feet, but it then began to fall. Seeing it gradually subsiding a boy, who was one of the party, resolved to go in search of an outlet. Swimming or holding on by the walls, he groped his way along the level, but soon fell into a hole and laid hold of a rail. Exhausted and chilled with cold, he returned to his comrades, who lay close to him to warm him, and then covered him with small coal. In that position he was found.

Sitting by our snug fire-sides hearing the wind howling without, we sometimes cast a thought of compassion towards the storm-tossed mariner, who may at that very moment be gulfed in the raging waves, or dashed to pieces upon the cruel rocks of some iron-bound coast; but we seldom think of the poor collier who has supplied us with the means of warmth and light at the expense of his life. In the year 1866 no fewer than 651 deaths were caused from explosions of fire-damp in English coal pits. It was an exceptionally disastrous year. It was the year of the Oaks Colliery and the Talk-o'-th'-Hill Colliery catastrophes, both of which occurred in the same week, and the first of which had no fewer than 361 victims, the largest number ever known. Happily this high figure is much in excess of the average. This gives one death for every 68,484 tons raised. Some coal fields are much more subject to fire-damp than others. In the Midland field,

extending through Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Warwickshire, and Notts, the average is low; and it is to be hoped that the just discovered coal measures in the last-mentioned county may maintain the character of the district for comparative freedom from disasters. Scotland is much more fortunate in this respect than the greater part of England. In the eastern portion of the Northern Kingdom 190,625 tons are raised for every life lost; while in Yorkshire the proportion of deaths is just six times as large. In that terribly fatal year, 1866, there were 1,484 lives lost among the 320,663 coal miners in Great Britain. These miners were at work in 3,192 collieries, and they raised 101,630,544 tons of coal. Large as was the proportion of lives lost through explosions of fire-damp, they were much fewer than those sacrificed by falls of roof, the proportion being as 169 to 446. The two bear much the same relation to the death list that is occupied by cholera and fever. The one slays its thousands all at once, and the world stands aghast; the second slays its tens of thousands one by one, and the world takes no heed.

For encountering this double risk—the risk of wholesale slaughter and of isolated death—the miner ought to be well compensated. The wages vary greatly. In Somersetshire a pitman gets lower wages than an agricultural labourer in the North of England, only 15s. and six cwt. of coal a week. In South Wales 22s. to 25s. is the average; in Lancashire 24s. to 28s.; but then the pitman has to pay for his own hauling. In South Staffordshire the pay is 4s. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a day, with an allowance of two quarts of beer daily and a ton of coals monthly. The best hewers get as much as 12s. per ton in the Newcastle district. In the Forest of Dean and in many parts of Wales the payment is by the ton. These figures are liable to variation. At a depressed time like the present, when, in consequence of the dulness of trade and manufactures, less coal is consumed, the coal owners naturally wish to stimulate consumption by lowering their prices; but if they do that they must persuade the pitmen to take lower wages. This condition is the most fertile source of disagreement. The employed look upon the employer as their natural enemy, against whom they must be continually prepared to make war. Hence frequent disastrous strikes. A remedy for this most unsatisfactory state of things has been devised, and, so far, has worked with great success. Messrs. Briggs having £80,000 invested in collieries, and finding that, in consequence of incessant disputes with their men and the resulting strikes, they were earning only four per cent. on their capital, determined to close their works, and to transfer their money to a more remunerative investment. Before carrying out their intention, it was suggested by one of the younger members of the firm that, as a last resource, the men should be taken into partnership with their employers, and receive a definite share of the profits. The result was to raise these almost immediately to 17 per cent. It was found that the men ceased to haggle about wages, because they knew that if they did not get paid in one way they would in another; hence there were no more strikes. They also became diligent con-

servers of their master's property, the machinery, the timber, and the candles, because all these were their own property. It only remains to see how they would stand the strain of a loss instead of a profit in order to determine if this 'partnership of industry' is the solution of the great problem of labour *versus* capital which some persons declare it to be. One thing is certain, a loss is much less likely to occur where hundreds are interested in making a profit than where it is only the units who are interested, and the hundreds are indifferent. This being so, it is remarkable that the principle of co-operation has not been extended more widely. There is still a powerful motive for extension, since strikes are abundant and frequent. True, the principle of arbitration is spreading; but, as prevention is better than cure, it is wiser to remove the causes of dispute than to heal the dispute after it has arisen. Unfortunately France and Belgium, which used to be free from strikes, have lately witnessed several; and one in the former country last summer led to a serious collision between the miners and the soldiers, which was marked by a lamentable loss of life. In one respect the continental miners are superior to our own. M. Simonin declares that the French collier is seldom drunk. He has a great love for his house, and will, if possible, become the owner of it. The employers generally let the houses at rents yielding less than 5 per cent. interest; or, if the miner wishes to build for himself, they supply him with lime, stone, and timber at cost price. Attached to the house is a garden, in which, when not too weary, he loves to work. In Belgium, unfortunately, as in England, the public-houses are a curse to the collier. The American colliers have a peculiar fondness for their tools. The German colliers form a sort of caste with peculiar costume, dress and manners, as well as freemasonry traditions, and even superstitions. There is a Teutonic proverb, 'Proud as a miner.' The Spanish colliers almost live on cigarettes, yet are energetic and industrious. The Italians have to work in the poisonous Maremma. So fatal is the exhalation from the marshes in this district that an emigration of miners takes place every summer; and when the cold weather and the colliers return, it is generally found that a large amount of work has to be done in order to repair the ravages made by the subterranean floods during the interval.

We have written thus fully upon the coal mines, because it is these which are really the most important economically, and which in their working offer the greatest number of interesting incidents. We could do without gold, for we could devise some other medium of commercial circulation. We could do without diamonds, and the majority of us would not know that the world had sustained any loss if every diamond were reduced to carbonic acid by the blow-pipe. There is only one of the metals whose absence would cause a serious retrogression in civilization—iron. That metal makes all the difference between civilization and barbarism. Fortunately for England iron is usually found in close neighbourhood to coal, and so the metal which is so infinitely more precious to us than the 'precious metals' so-called, is accompanied by the mineral which is necessary

to work it. The total iron ore production in the United Kingdom in 1868, was 10,169,231 tons, valued at £3,196,600. More than one-third of the whole amount was, according to Mr. Hunt's mineral statistics, produced by Yorkshire; Scotland yielded, 1,250,000 tons; Staffordshire, only a little less; Lancashire, 767,625 tons; South Wales and Monmouthshire, nearly the same amount. It will, we think, surprise our readers, as it has certainly surprised us, to learn that Northumberland and Durham, in spite of their large iron ship-building rivers, yield far less iron (125,000 tons) than Lincolnshire, which is commonly supposed to be an essentially agricultural county, but which, nevertheless, yields 205,699 tons. Derbyshire and Northamptonshire were a long way a-head of both counties, and Cumberland yields nearly as much as all four put together, viz., 926,628 tons. Ireland also is far in the rear, and contributes but 41,469 tons, worth £10,492, too small an amount to increase materially the prosperity of the people. Iron requires, not only much labour to raise it, but much more to convert it into use. The hull alone of the Great Eastern required 10,000 tons of iron. Assuming that the ore yielded 50 per cent. of metal, this would involve the raising of 20,000 tons of ore, and from 40,000 to 50,000 tons of coal, the whole year's produce of a very rich iron and coal mine. England at present stands far in advance of other countries as to this produce.

The total yield of iron, cast iron and steel, throughout the world, was in 1865, 9,500,000 tons, of which our own country produced just over one-half, 4,900,000 tons. France and the United States followed next, but *longo intervallo*, with 1,200,000 each. Belgium and Prussia were next with 500,000 each; all other countries yielded less than half a million tons. The total amount reckoned at the mean price of £8 per ton would give a value of £76,000,000, while that of coal is nearly £89,500,000. The price of iron varies much more than that of coal, and therefore there is more room for speculation and therefore for larger fortunes, and also for heavier losses in the iron than in the coal trade. One of the most remarkable discoveries connected with the first was that the Cleveland hills were a mass of ironstone. It is discoveries like these which have led to the sudden springing up of large towns like Middlesborough and Barrow-in-Furness, both of which were, about thirty years ago, unknown villages. An invention of another sort, that of converting iron into steel in large masses by a cheap process, has brought the inventor, Mr. Bessemer, an enormous fortune which, so long as his patent lasts, yields him, it has been said, about the same income as the Marquis of Westminster's. During 1868 the number of works using Mr. Bessemer's process and paying a royalty to him was 17 in England, 7 in the United States, 10 in Austria, 12 in Sweden, and 8 in other countries, or 61 in all.

South America was, until lately, the chief source of our supply of the 'precious' metals. But the mines of Bolivia and Peru, as well as those of Mexico and Central America, have been in great part abandoned. The depth of the works, the influx of subterranean water, and constant civil wars have combined to bring about this

result. The mines of Potosi, in the first mentioned country, during the two centuries from the Spanish conquest to the emancipation, yielded to Spain silver to the value of £240,000,000. Just as the silver mines seemed to be exhausted the discoveries of gold in California took place. These were followed by others in Australia, and later still in New Zealand. The gold deposits of Australia may be said to have been discovered by a man who never saw them, who has always lived at their antipodes. It is one of the triumphs of science that Sir Roderick Murchison, reasoning from the nature of the rocks which he was told were in Australia, and finding that they were precisely similar to the auriferous rocks of the Ural Mountains which he had just visited, announced confidently that there was gold in our great colony, and so soon as search was made it confirmed his bold statement. In New Zealand the discoveries have been more recent, and quite lately some 240 companies have been started to work the gold fields. All have done well. In some instances £10 shares have, in the course of a few months, become worth £15,000, and among the lucky speculators is the Duke of Edinburgh, who has made £200,000. This great influx of gold seriously alarmed our financiers and political economists. It seemed as if the standard of our gold currency must be considerably altered. The money market was embarrassed by its riches. A cure soon offered. At the close of 1859 there came word of a great discovery of silver in the State of Nevada, which is separated from California by the snowy chain of the Sierra. A French engineer was sent to report upon the discovery. He confirmed all that had been reported, and at the present time the silver mines are producing metal to nearly twice the value of that raised in the gold fields. About 16,000,000 dollars are raised annually from the Comstock lode, which is among the richest and most productive metalliferous deposits ever encountered in the history of mining enterprise. In fact, the yield from this one vein was very nearly one-fourth of the produce of all the silver mines in the world. The mines of the Pacific slope of the United States yield annually 100,000,000 dollars of the precious metals, or more than four times as much as the total produce of the world less than 30 years ago. When it is remembered that the United States contain also immense stores of coal and iron, that in Minnesota forty men were, in 1854, engaged for a whole year in cutting up a single mass of native copper weighing 500 tons, that zinc, nickel, and lead are also found in the States, it is clear that that country must hereafter take the lead of all other nations. Our patriotism may make us slow to believe this, and yet if we doubt it we have only to examine the condition of our own metalliferous mines. A visit to Cornwall at the present time will convince us that the ancient glory of that famous district has departed. Mine after mine has been closed. A large number of the most skilful miners have emigrated to North and South America, or to Australia. In the old country the metals have to be raised at a heavy cost from great depths; in the new they are on the surface, or but a little way below it. The tin of the Dutch settlements in

Asia is driving our own tin out of our own markets ; the copper of Chili is in like manner competing with the copper of Cornwall. Thus does Providence draw men from the districts which are over-crowded to the wastes which have to be peopled, for in the eyes of the Divine ruler of the earth the whole world is but one country, its inhabitants but one race. We, if we are wise, shall assent with cheerfulness to this arrangement, and not suffer any narrow local prejudice to obscure the wisdom of the plan which, though it may diminish the prestige of England, increases the happiness of mankind.

It is worthy of note how often discoveries which are of lasting benefit to the race bring only disaster to the individual. Godoy, the discoverer in 1831 of the richest vein of silver in Chili, was a hunter among the Andes. One day, while resting, he remarked the singular colour and brightness of an overhanging rock. He found that he could cut it like cheese, and, taking it to the mineralogists of Copiapo, they declared it to be chloride of silver. By the Spanish law the discoverer of a mine becomes its owner, and Godoy entered into partnership with an experienced man for working the new-found treasure. It proved most productive, but Godoy, being of a roving disposition, determined to seek new mines, sold his share for £2,800, failed in his search, and, after having squandered his money in dissipation, died penniless. Marshall, a Mormon labourer, was one day early in 1848 digging a race for a saw mill in California, when he found some pieces of yellow metal which he believed to be gold. He entrusted it to a friend, who, on showing it to an expert at San Francisco, at once confirmed the supposition, and the expert returned with the messenger to the place where the metal was found, and in a few months thousands of persons were pouring into the gold field, so that in three years the population of California rose from 15,000 to 100,000. Though millions sterling were raised, Marshall in 1859 was quite forgotten, and was poorer than before. This rule of *sic vos non vobis* has its exceptions. The shepherd who, while lighting a fire in Peru, was struck by a shining stone, and, taking it to Lima, found it to be silver, and so led to the discovery of the most famous mines in Peru, became a millionaire. The poor Irishmen who some fourteen years ago discovered one of the richest gold mines in Nevada, amassed princely fortunes, built splendid mansions, but retained their original simplicity. Sometimes both good and evil fortune are experienced. The Brothers Bolados who discovered an enormous block of silver ore in a crevice opened by some earthquake, made £140,000 in two years, squandered it in dissipation, and when it was gone learnt too late that their mine was exhausted.

We have not space to speak of other metals, nor of gems. Much interesting information respecting them is given in M. Simonin's work. For that book we must say a word of commendation. It is a magnificent volume, a real *livre de luxe*. The manner in which the tints of the most variegated metals are represented in the coloured engravings is really marvellous. Altogether the volume would be a most valuable addition both to the shelves of the library and to the drawing-room table.

---

## STATISTICAL DATA FOR SOCIAL REFORMERS.

## 1. PROHIBITORY PARISHES IN THE PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

MANY of the readers of *Meliora* have read the admirable Report of the Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury upon the Causes, Extent, and Remedies of Intemperance. One large edition of that invaluable document has already been disposed of, and another is in course of preparation. One of the most interesting features of that volume is a list of parishes, townships, and chapelries in the Province of Canterbury, where no sale of intoxicating liquors, whether ardent spirits, wine, or beer, is licensed. Referring to this social phenomenon the committee say (and these weighty words are the last of their Report), 'Few, it may be believed, are cognizant of the fact—which has been elicited by the present inquiry—that there are at this time, within the Province of Canterbury, upwards of 1,000 parishes in which there is neither public-house nor beershop; and where, in consequence of the absence of these inducements to crime and pauperism, according to the evidence before the committee, the intelligence, morality, and comfort of the people, are such as the friends of temperance would have anticipated.' The number of these places is underrated by the committee; and if any one is in doubt concerning the effects described, let him turn to the appendix of the Report, where under the letters J. J. they will find twenty-nine pages filled with testimonies from local observers upon 'the good effects of having no public-house or beershop.' The list of these favoured parishes follows this long line of evidence, and occupies another eleven pages. We are now in the position, by favour of the editor of *Graham's Temperance Guide* for 1870, to present a classified summary of places, according to counties, with a statement of the proportion of the population in each county thus shielded from many forms of evil to which their neighbours are still exposed.

The Ecclesiastical Province of Canterbury comprised in 1861 a population of 14,071,164, residing in 33 English counties, the Principality of Wales 12 counties, and the Channel Islands.

Name of County.	Population in 1861.	No. of Places reported without a drink-shop.	Population of Places without a drink-shop.	Places— reported but population not known.
Bedfordshire ...	135,287	11	1,240	—
Berkshire ...	176,256	11	1,769	1
Buckinghamshire ...	167,993	35	4,540	2
Cambridgeshire ...	176,016	8	1,172	—
Cornwall ...	369,390	25	4,471	1
Derbyshire ...	339,327	19	4,236	—
Devonshire ...	584,373	22	5,101	—
Dorsetshire ...	188,789	107	18,073	4
Essex... ...	405,851	35	5,034	1
Gloucestershire ...	485,770	84	14,053	6
Hampshire ...	481,815	8	1,867	—
Herefordshire ...	123,712	96	16,418	3
Hertfordshire ...	173,280	2	170	—
Huntingdonshire ...	64,250	8	861	—
Kent ...	733,887	37	3,533	2
Leicestershire ...	237,412	79	10,150	3
Lincolnshire ...	412,246	113	19,156	—
Middlesex ...	2,206,485	—	—	—
Monmouthshire ...	104,633	27	3,096	—
Norfolk ...	434,798	127	16,663	5
Northamptonshire ...	227,704	57	5,165	2
Nottinghamshire ...	293,867	52	7,451	1
Oxfordshire ...	170,944	8	1,380	—
Rutlandshire ...	21,861	14	1,368	3
Shropshire ...	240,959	61	9,777	2
Somersetshire ...	444,873	14	2,724	1
Staffordshire ...	746,943	23	2,341	—

Name of County.	Population in 1861.	No. of Places reported without a drink-shop.	Population of Places without a drink-shop.	Places reported but population not known.
Suffolk	337,070	6	1,178	—
Surrey	831,093	7	1,086	—
Sussex	363,736	13	1,812	—
Warwickshire	561,855	41	7,180	5
Wiltshire	249,311	54	8,595	5
Worcestershire	307,397	39	6,417	—
WALES.				
Anglesea	54,609	31	7,197	—
Breconshire	61,627	3	459	—
Cardiganshire	72,245	15	5,222	—
Carmarthenshire	111,796	2	584	—
Carnarvonshire	95,694	15	4,238	—
Denbighshire	100,778	9	107	8
Flintshire	69,737	7	—	—
Glamorganshire	317,752	16	1,854	1
Merionethshire	38,963	15	4,511	—
Montgomeryshire	66,919	7	2,143	2
Pembrokeshire	96,278	40	6,946	1
Radnorshire	25,382	—	—	—
13,979,962				
Part of Chester (St. David's Diocese)	224	—	—	—
Channel Islands	90,978	—	—	—
Population of Pro- vince of Canterbury 14,971,164				
		1,397	222,258	70

Some curious inferences are deducible from this return. For one thing it appears that in the Province of Canterbury one in every sixty-seven persons lives in a prohibitory district; and if the counties not blest by a prohibitory district are excluded from the calculation, the proportion will be one in every fifty-seven persons; and if, further, the whole metropolitan district is excluded, the population will be one in every fifty-three. The Province of York though smaller in area and population than that of Canterbury, would probably show still more striking results: and we trust that, officially or unofficially, the inquiry will soon be carried on; and the facts published to the world.

## II. CONSUMPTION OF SPIRITS IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND, IN THE YEARS 1865-6-7-8.

A recent Parliamentary return, moved for by Sir T. E. Colebrooke, M.P., enables us to see at a glance the consumption of each kind of ardent spirit in each of the three countries making up the United Kingdom during the four years ending December, 1868.

The British spirits (gin and whisky) may be taken first:—

	1865.	1866.	1867.	1868.
England, gallons .....	11,238,105	11,717,111	11,323,713	11,327,223
Scotland     ",.....	5,198,607	5,463,465	4,983,009	4,901,710
Ireland     ",.....	4,374,443	5,036,814	4,892,654	4,773,710

U. Kingdom, galls.....	20,811,155	22,217,390	21,199,376	21,002,643
------------------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

The Colonial spirits (rum) follow next:—

	1865.	1866.	1867.	1868.
England, gallons .....	3,414,782	3,777,404	3,861,291	3,486,731
Scotland     ",.....	203,073	252,259	345,152	359,713
Ireland     ",.....	80,483	97,457	106,379	103,640

U. Kingdom, galls.....	3,698,338	4,127,120	4,312,822	3,950,084
------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

The Foreign spirits (brandy, Geneva, &c.), bring up the rear:—

	1865.	1866.	1867.	1868.
England, gallons .....	2,645,304	3,104,392	3,300,105	3,643,836
Scotland .....	219,437	337,420	475,257	551,160
Ireland .....	169,627	228,538	249,015	253,737
U. Kingdom, galls.....	3,084,368	3,670,350	4,024,377	4,448,733

  

	1865.	1866.	1867.	1868.
England, gallons .....	17,293,191	18,598,907	18,485,109	18,457,790
Scotland .....	5,621,117	6,053,144	5,803,418	5,812,583
Ireland .....	4,624,553	5,362,809	5,248,048	5,131,087
U. Kingdom, galls.....	27,543,861	30,014,860	29,536,575	29,401,460

It thus appears that comparing the totals of the four years, the unenviable supremacy was borne off by 1866, but that 1868, while less than both 1866 and 1867, witnessed an excess over 1865 of 1,857,599 gallons, to which the various countries contributed—England, 1,159,599 gallons; Scotland, 191,466; and Ireland, 506,534. The principal increase (1,414,365 gallons) has been in foreign spirits, the use of which, under the French treaty has risen very considerably; and as the purchasers of brandy are not usually the very poor, the well-to-do classes have not much to boast of, in these figures, in evidence of that growing sobriety among the higher classes, concerning which so much is affirmed and so little proved.

### III. THE COST OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN 1868.

The 'Companion' to the 'British Almanack for 1870' contains a paper by Dr. S. Smiles, under the title of 'Self-imposed Taxation—National Expenditure on Drink and Tobacco.' Dr. Smiles enters into a careful consideration of the expenditure in intoxicating liquors in 1868; and, as ignorant opponents of temperance are fond of railing at statistics, 'cooked,' as they say, by temperance writers, it will be well to compare Dr. Smiles's conclusions with those already published in 'Meliora,' and other organs of temperance and social reform.

	'Meliora' Estimate.	Dr. Smiles's Estimate.
Ardent spirits .....	£30,253,605	£30,568,232
Wine .....	11,363,805	12,987,927
Beer .....	59,768,870	43,749,556
British wines, cider, perry, &c.	1,500,000	1,500,000
	£102,886,280	£88,805,715

So that the difference between the two computations is only fourteen millions sterling. An examination of the causes of this difference will not only show how it arises, but will make it evident that the higher result is a nearer approximation than Dr. Smiles's total to the actual drink expenditure of the British nation in 1868. In regard to both spirits and wine, Dr. Smiles's sums are in excess of those presented in 'Meliora,' in the aggregate proportion of £43,556,159 to £41,617,411. On the contrary, in regard to beer, the 'Meliora' estimate is greatly above that of Dr. Smiles. There is no authentic measurement of the amount of beer licensed and consumed within the United Kingdom; and Dr. Smiles, in grounding his calculation on the malt used for home consumption, takes  $3\frac{1}{2}$  barrels as produced from each quarter of malt. The Excise computation, however, gives one barrel to two bushels, or four barrels to every quarter; and hence arises the difference in the quantity of beer brewed, which Dr. Smiles places at 749,983,824 gallons, and 'Meliora' at 896,533,056 gallons, or 24,903,696 barrels. Again, Dr. Smiles supposes each gallon to cost the revenue 1s. 2d. = 42s. a barrel, whereas we have estimated it to bring the retailer 48s.; and that this estimate is not excessive will appear if it be remembered that the retailer pays for each barrel 36s., and that according to the testimony of witnesses before the Public-house Select Committee of 1853-4 a profit of 35 per cent. is obtained, in some way or other, by the vendor. Dr. Smiles, indeed, freely admits that a much higher sum is derived from this source, for, he observes, 'if

the dilution and adulteration of the beer as sold over the counter and in the beer-houses be taken into account, and it is considered that by far the largest proportion is sold to the working classes at 4d. and 6d. a quart, it will probably be admitted that this estimate is very considerably within the probable actual expenditure.' We conclude, therefore, that our own estimate for 1868 is very moderate, and that if it err at all it does so by underrating the money lavished by the British people on intoxicating drinks—sum equal to £3. 6s. 8d. for each person in the United Kingdom, or £16. 13s. 6d. for every family of five persons. Taking into account the number of persons and families who are abstainers, the average for persons and families who use alcoholic liquors will reach a still higher amount, showing that on the drink, which produces no sensible good but much terrible evil, as much money is annually expended by the people of this country as would go far towards lodging and clothing them the whole year round.

---

### THE STOKER'S REVENGE.

'Do say you love me, Maggie.'  
 'Love you, Arthur! how much?'  
 'What a tease you can be, Maggie!'  
 'So you want me to say I love you, eh, Arthur? Well, then, of course I do; I'm not a heathen, and its the duty, you know, of every Christian man and woman to love their neighbour, so I love you, Arthur. How much, you would say? Well, you see that saucy little bird on the twig there, with its smart red waistcoat and pert black eye; I love you, Arthur, just as much as, and understand me, no more than, *perhaps*, *sotto voce*, 'that little bird. Isn't he a pretty little fellow?'

And her sweet, joyous laugh rang out, half vexing, half charming her admirer.

So they walked on through the pleasant wood, bare, as yet, with the ravages of winter. A few brown, dry leaves still clung on the trees like the rags of a once magnificent royal robe hanging from the shoulders of a deposed and exiled king; and here and there, where the spring sunshine had coaxed the young buds forth to meet him, the lamb's tails, as the children call them, hung thickly on every bough, looking as if not only little Bo Peep's flock, but thousands of little lambs besides, had run home and *left* instead of *bringing* their tails behind them. Beside the path on which they trod murmured and roared the never-ceasing river—here breaking over stones with indignant haste and fury, there quietly gliding on its smooth course to the sea—here sparkling and foaming in the sunshine, there green and cold in deep, deep pools, strangely typical of the two young hearts that wandered on so carelessly beside it. Amongst the

grass the starry primroses peeped forth, with fair, sweet faces, to look at them; the bluebells and orchids showed their long green leaves amongst the copse-wood; and over head the birds twittered, and whistled, and warbled with the gay joyousness of early spring.

Maggie Symons was the prettiest girl in Meryton. She had lived petted, healthy, happy country life up to this, her twentieth summer. She was the only daughter of a small farmer, whose fields skirted the woods and river, brought up amongst plenty and comfort without a care—the idol of her indulgent father and group of brothers, and the pride even of the mother who found fault with every other member of the house for spoiling her, and insisted on her working diligently towards her maintenance.

Her rich profusion of black and glossy hair, her bright colour, her merry brown eyes, her gay smile, her regular features and finely rounded figure, and her saucy demeanour brought her hosts of admirers, and she sported amongst them like a chased butterfly amongst its pursuers, now giving hope to one, now to another, and then to a third, and at last flying entirely away from them all to give occupation and excitement to a new group somewhere else. She toyed with men's hearts quite carelessly, not from malice, but from the feminine love of power which some women calculate upon possessing for only a limited time, and accordingly make the most of while youth and beauty last, and partly, too, because her own heart was still untouched, and an unbounded love of fun made her enjoy to tease the 'poor doting creatures.'

'Maggie,' said Arthur, after a silence on his part which had lasted some minutes, while his companion had been singing 'My love she's but a lassie yet,' 'Maggie, do you care about anybody at all?'

'Don't I,' said Maggie provokingly, pouting her rosy lips; 'anybody at all! I should think so; why, if you could have seen me and Luke Weston here in this wood last week by moonlight, you might have thought I liked somebody then.'

'Luke Weston!' exclaimed Arthur Coles, drawing himself up to his full height, and growing pale with passion, 'how dare he? let me know that he comes here again with you in that style, and by heaven I'll have my revenge.'

Maggie was almost frightened. 'Nonsense, Arthur, I'm not bound to you, and you've no right to order me or Luke to obey you,' she said seriously; and then, laughing again, 'I'll keep my freedom a long time yet, Arthur; you mustn't expect to have me pledge myself to anybody for half-a-dozen years at least; twenty-six! that's the age my mother was married at, and she says its plenty young enough to tie yourself to the best of men, and none of you boys can come up to father.'

'Did you come here alone with Luke by moonlight?' asked Arthur in a hollow voice. He did not appear to have heard what she had been last saying.

'Come, come, Mr. Arthur Coles, you've no business to ask me questions in that fashion, and what is more to the purpose, a jealous man would never suit me; if you can't keep your temper, Arthur, we'll say good-bye at once.' She turned with a mocking curtsey, and ran off towards her home, but she was no match for the fleet footsteps of Arthur Coles; he was presently by her side again.

'Oh! Maggie, I can't play about it; tell me you love me; give me a right to take care of you; promise to be my wife.'

He held her hands in his, and gazed into her eyes; his voice trembled, his lips quivered, and his face was very white.

'Don't you remember the little bird, Arthur? I love you and I love Mr. Redbreast, won't that suit you?'

Maggie laughed again, but her laugh was somewhat constrained. Arthur's appearance moved her, as it must have moved any woman.

'I see how it is, Luke has made you care more for him than you do for me.'

'You are silly, Arthur.'

'Can you deny it, Maggie?'

'I don't choose to give you an account of my actions and thoughts.'

The girl arched her neck and curled her lip.

'Then you wish me never to come near you again, Maggie?'

Arthur's voice was half choked with sorrow and passion.

'Nonsense, Arthur, I don't want to lose my friends; at the farm they all think you're a favourite with me, but you frightened me when you talk of marrying.'

Arthur heaved a deep sigh. 'Bless you for those kind words, Maggie.' I felt almost mad just now, with Luke and with myself too. May I go home with you?'

'Yes,' she said, half slyly, 'if you want to.'

Arthur, still holding her hands, bent low over her face, and kissed her sweet lips; she tossed her head back from him, a rich warm blush mantled her face and neck, and she gave him a reproving tap on his shoulder, and then without another word he drew her arm within his, and at a quick pace they returned to the farm.

Arthur Coles and Luke Weston were stoker and engine driver on the same line. They were not always together, but generally both went on the engine of the night express to London, which leaving Merton at 11 p.m., reached the metropolis about seven on the following morning.

But though both the young men were suitors for the hand of Maggie, they were extremely opposite in their characteristics; Luke was singularly gentle, affectionate, and trustful; Arthur, as we have seen, passionate, jealous, and suspicious. Every advantage that he imagined Luke to have gained over the heart of Maggie was the occasion of an outburst of angry feeling either to the girl he loved, or the more successful rival. These outbursts Maggie laughed at or pretended to grow offended. Luke bore them with kindness and patience. And still Maggie tantalised them both, and held in her hand, as it appeared, the fate of three or four more with equal nonchalance. Her conduct cannot be defended. In the lighthearted happiness of her life she did not dream of the real

misery she was thus creating; it was such fun to reign as a queen over Arthur to-day, Luke to-morrow, and Bob and Harry and Dick the days following, to see the rough, rude fellows trying to be as attentive to her least wish as the greatest gentleman born. And who knew if, after all, the old gipsy words would not prove true, and her husband be a rich lord with his coach and six, and golden guineas in a golden purse, and not one of these poor, half-educated fellows after all?

\* \* \* \* \*

Through the darkness of a moonless night at the end of March, in blinding rain and howling, blustering wind, the night express from Merton to London dashed along. The gleam of the fire flashed up into the darkness amongst the thick smoke, and the red lights of the engine glared like the eyes of some wild beast amidst the storm.

Before setting out on his journey that terrible night Arthur Coles had entered the 'Dragon' public-house in Merton, called for a dram, and swallowed it eagerly.

'We shall have a rough journey to-night, landlord.'

'Yes,' said the besotted old man to whom he spoke, 'that you will, Coles; I don't envy engine drivers and stokers, poor devils, such a night as this.'

'That's a pretty name to call your customers by,' said Coles, in an irritated tone.

'No offence, Mr. Coles, no offence, it's only my way; why 'twould be a chance if I met an angel, but what I'd call him devil before I'd done with him.'

'Devils are more in your line, are they?' remarked Arthur ironically. 'What do you call Luke Weston, for instance, is he angel or devil?'

The old man grinned. 'Young men are apt to be jealous of each other when pretty girls are in the way.'

'Fool!' muttered Arthur, 'who said I was jealous or had any reason to be jealous of Luke Weston? What girl that had any spirit would prefer a poor, cringing, meek fellow like that to a man who was head over ears in love with her, and not afraid to tell her so.'

'Oh! it's come to that, is it, Mr. Coles?'

'Come to what, landlord?'

'Why a *bond fide* match.'

'I never said so, and I'd thank you to hold your tongue on that and every

other matter concerning me. Here fill me this flask, best brandy mind; I shall have need for it to-night.'

'You will truly; if ever a man wanted the good stuff to keep his soul within him, 'tis to-night.'

'Luke doesn't give you the favour of his custom, landlord?'

'I don't believe he favours anybody; he's a mean, careful fellow, and latterly he's been more stingy than ever.'

'Saving, eh?' asked Arthur.

'Yes, saving for housekeeping,' chuckled the landlord, 'but you'll stop that business I reckon, Mr. Coles.'

'Did you ever see the girl with him?' demanded Arthur, talking more freely now that the dram was coursing through his veins.

'Come into the parlour, Mr. Coles, it's comfortable in there, and no one in yet, it wants nearly two hours to your train, and we'll have a snug glass and a little confidential talk; no harm meant to any party, you understand?' The old man winked one of his small eyes.

'I don't mind if I do,' said Arthur, 'I want to get warm before I leave, and the station's a cold place to wait about, and I don't mind telling you that Luke and I will have hours enough to spend together to-night, without talking beforehand.'

'Missis,' called the landlord to his wife, 'bring us some hot water and sugar and a lemon, will ye? Sit down by the fire, Mr. Coles; throw on some wood, missis, and make it cheery.'

The pleasant fire crackled and burned brightly, and Arthur sat very close to it, his feet on the fender, and his arms folded, and over his face a dark cloud hovering. 'Now, then, landlord,' he said, when the door was shut, and the old man was busy at the manufacture of the grog, 'now, then, tell me what you have seen.'

'Girls will be girls,' said the old landlord philosophically, tasting the grog to ascertain its sweetness, 'and Maggie Symons, bless her pretty face, hasn't a mind to shut herself up in a corner.'

'That's nothing here nor there,' cried Arthur, impatiently kicking his foot against the fender, and thereby upsetting the fire-irons with a loud noise, 'tell me, landlord, have you ever seen Luke and Maggie alone together?'

'More than once,' replied the old man slowly, as if to add a sting to this intelligence, 'more than once, they've

walked up into the wood together of an evening, taking a bit of an airing, you know, when its been moonlight; the old farmer is partial to Luke, 'cause of his canting ways, and they trust Maggie with him, and no mistake.'

'You're sure of this?' exclaimed Arthur, springing to his feet, and going close to the landlord, 'answer me, man, turn round, look me in the face, and answer me.' A fierce grasp was on the landlord's shoulder, and he turned obediently.

'I'm telling the truth, Arthur Coles, and what harm is there in it? Next moon maybe she'll go with you.'

'I swear,' said Arthur solemnly, 'that Maggie Symons shall NEVER enter that wood again with Luke Weston. Curse him, he has taught her to make a fool of me.'

'Come now, come now, you are going too far, take a glass of my grog, Mr. Coles, and you'll feel better, there's more than one pretty girl in the world, isn't there?'

Arthur sat moodily by the fire, and did not speak. The old man put a chair between them to rest their glasses on, handed him a tumbler of the steaming beverage, and sat down on the opposite side of the fireplace. The wind whistled down the chimney, puffing the smoke every now and then into their faces, and a scowl rested on Arthur's brow, growing more settled and intense every moment, for the devils, drink, jealousy, anger, and revenge were holding their black carnival in his heart.

'Do you smoke, Mr. Coles?'

Arthur started. His mind was far away on the engine half-way to London, just at the long run between the towns of Atherley and Greystone; he came back with an effort to the 'Dragon' bar parlour, 'No, landlord, it makes me ill.'

'You don't object to a pipe for me, perhaps,' said the old man, to whom this *tête-à-tête* with the stoker was not the jolly affair, spiced, perhaps, with a little anger, that he had expected it to be.

'No, do as you like,' answered Arthur, coolly emptying the tumbler of grog, 'only pour me out another glass,' and then relapsed again into moody silence.

'How long does it take you to walk to the station, Mr. Coles?' said the landlord after ten minutes, when the only noises had been the occasional clinking of the glasses and the puffing he made from his own pipe.

'A quarter of an hour, landlord. What is the time?'

'Just past ten.'

'Then I'd better be off. Good night. Stop; where's the flask? How much do I owe you? A pint of brandy fills it, doesn't it? What have I had? One dram, three glasses of grog, and a room to sit and think in. I've not been good company, old fellow; maybe I'd do better next time. Give me the change.'

He threw half-a-sovereign on the table, pocketed the brandy flask, picked up the silver, and with another 'Good night, landlord,' left the house. He walked through the storm at a furious pace to the station, and was there in good time, and in less than an hour afterwards was whirled along the line towards the metropolis. He had hardly spoken to Luke, and then in a snappish, ungracious manner; but the latter appeared absorbed in some pleasant thoughts, for Arthur noticed by the glare of the engine fire that he smiled to himself and whistled gaily amidst the storm. A slight circumstance added to the stoker's fury. Once as Luke drew near the fire behind the screen to warm his benumbed hands, Arthur observed that he wore a pair of scarlet thick cuffs around his wrists. They seemed to show a woman's thoughtfulness for his comfort, and the young man remarked bitterly, 'You take precious good care of yourself, Luke Weston.'

'Rather; I've people kind enough to take good care of me, Arthur.'

'That's it, is it? I thought so. May-be you like a confounded little flirt to work for you, who'd make a pair of scarlet cuffs for the devil himself if he coaxed and kissed and asked her for them.'

'Arthur,' said Luke, kindly, 'I'm not speaking of Maggie. It was old Mrs. Symons, Maggie's grandmother, who gave them to me. She's a kind old lady, as you know, and would have made you a pair with just as much pleasure. Don't let us quarrel, man. The wind and rain are enough to be at war with to-night. I can hardly see a few yards before me for the biting hail-showers.'

Arthur did not speak aloud, but he muttered a curse against Luke as the latter went back to his post.

On and on! How little the first-class passengers, sheltered and warm, thought of the sufferings of the engine driver and stoker that night, not so bad either

for Arthur as for Luke, for he was constantly by the warm fire. On and on! flying past the little stations in the country, where sleepy station masters hoisted the signal of safety. On and on! only pausing to take breath at the larger towns and cities. And now Atherley was reached, and as they waited here for ten minutes, the two men got off the engine and walked about a little. Luke had a cup of hot coffee, and Arthur took a long draught from his little flask, and the fiery liquid rushed into his brain, filling him with the excitement that he desired to feel. The passengers bustled about getting refreshments and hurrying again into their snug carriages. Gentlemen curled themselves up in their rugs, wrapped the few ladies who travelled at night comfortably in their warm shawls, and brought them tea and coffee, or a few drops of brandy to keep out the cold. The fresh arrivals took their places; the few who alighted at their journey's end made their way speedily with their luggage to the cabs outside; the engine screamed its note of warning, the guard whistled, and on went the train again. This was at two a.m., and there was no stopping again for an hour and forty minutes, and then they would reach Greystone. Arthur hugged himself in an ecstasy of mad delight, and muttered, 'Now I've got you, old fellow, and I'll have my revenge.' He waited like a tiger in his lair, sipping at the flask till Luke came once more to warm himself. 'Tis good to get near fire such a night as this and no mistake,' he said good temperedly, glancing up at Arthur from his stooping position over the fire. The stoker's face was full of terrible passion, the big veins on his forehead were swollen, his brow knit, his lips compressed, his teeth set, and his eyes glared under their shaggy eyebrows. The animal nature had asserted its empire, the Godlike seemed banished utterly.

'What's the matter, Arthur, are you ill?'

Luke could not understand that dreadful face.

'Ill? why should I be ill? what odds is it to me if Maggie Symons is a little fool, and chooses to throw herself away upon a pale, spiritless coward, who cares nothing about her, more than to get what other men want.'

Luke coloured to the roots of his hair. Hot, indignant words came from his lips, but he understood and pitied

Arthur, and he struggled to conquer himself.

'Hush, Arthur, don't let's quarrel to-night, the people in the train won't thank us if we do. Maggie's a bright, beautiful girl, you know it and I know it, but I'm afraid she'll not make up her mind to have either of us just yet; so we needn't quarrel till she refuses you or me.'

'Don't gammon me, Luke, I'm not in a temper to be soft-soaped to-night, the girl goes with you alone to take moonlight walks in the old wood; and she's refused me to do that. Not once or twice, Master Sneak, but many times you've gone there with her, don't suppose nobody sees you, can't I employ watchers if I will?'

'You can,' replied Luke gravely and calmly, 'but you would hardly be so mean.'

'Mean! mean!! mean!!!' cried Arthur passionately, with an oath, 'how dare you call me mean, Luke Weston? you shall fight for this.'

The brandy and the passion rendered Arthur furious, his eyes glared, his nostrils were distended, and he stood before Luke like a madman as the latter still stooped over the fire. Now Luke raised himself; thanks to his sobriety and his good temper, he was able to estimate their position, to dread the consequences of any rash word on his part, and to feel kindly towards his rival. 'Come Arthur, if we must fight about it, let us choose a larger ground than a railway engine. We're not our own masters till seven in the morning, and then we'll talk about it.'

'Coward,' exclaimed Arthur, 'you're afraid to fight me.'

'I am on a railway engine, and you should be afraid too, Arthur.'

'I'm not afraid, I have justice on my side; you've stolen my Maggie from me, Luke Weston—the prettiest, sweetest girl that ever lived till she knew you.' The poor fellow's voice faltered. 'She'd almost told me half-a-dozen times that she loved me till you came round, sneaking round; and now I've found you out man, and here is your battlefield, and I swear you shall fight for her before we reach Greystone.'

Luke glanced nervously round, to judge whether he could make his way to the guard's van; he might have tried, but how leave the engine? And might not Arthur follow him? Duty and

read both forbade, and he could not take care of the lives entrusted to him, could not watch the line for signals, if he attempted thus to insure his own safety. Perhaps it would have been wiser to risk this, but his sense of honour made him hesitate, and in another moment the grasp of the infuriated Arthur was upon him, and dear life was to be fought for on that narrow field. On and on through the night the engine pursued its way; and fiercely upon it the battle raged between the two lovers of beautiful Maggie. If she could have seen them, what terror would have shone forth from those bright eyes! But she lay peacefully upon her snowy bed, and pleasant dreams, not, alas! of Arthur nor of Luke, but of one she was beginning to feel dearer than either, made sweet smiles fit across the rosy lips, and warm blushes suffuse the cheeks, and fond words escape her tongue.

And now, after many thrusts, and many dreadful blows, and many near escapes from falling over the edge of the engine, Luke has Arthur in his power, and with a firm grasp he holds him down. The firelight gleams on the foaming lips and staring eyes; shall he kill him in self-defence? 'Would it be murder? An intense longing to be free from this mad companionship, this fearful death struggle, makes him feel for his only weapon—his pocket-knife; but he pauses as his hand seeks it in his pocket, and, taking the opportunity, Arthur, with a mad leap, is on his feet again, and in another moment they have changed places.

'Coward,' cried Arthur tauntingly, 'there you lie, my prisoner; no knife is needed to finish you; I have but to thrust you into the burning flames, and you'll be a martyr to your love. Or better still, get up, man, and I'll hurl you from your engine. How can I help it if you've thrown yourself off?'

'For God's sake, Arthur Coles, if you will murder me remember the other lives against whom you have no grudge, and who are in this train; conduct them safely to Greystone, and then ask for another driver, and may God have mercy on you.'

'God!' shrieked Arthur, 'no, talk not to me of God; I'm the servant of the devil, and I'll have my *REVENGE*!'

He glanced around the engine, dragged Luke to one side, and pushed him violently over. A man's despairing

death-cry rose to heaven as Luke fell under the wheels, and Arthur grinned as he heard the crunching of his enemy's bones. When the train had whirled past, he looked back beyond the line of carriages, and in the faintest streaks of the grey dawn he saw something white upon the rails, and chuckled and grinned and shouted with triumph as he gazed and gazed until it was lost to sight.

He glanced then upon his bloody garments, and felt, with a dread instinct more than by any effort of reason, that they would condemn him. Greystone was soon within sight; he made no effort to stop the engine, and it went quickly past the station, though all the brakes of the guard's van were applied. The guard, in terror at the event, came cautiously along to the engine to have it explained; he found Arthur alone, and the stoker's garments bore witness to a deadly fray.

'What has happened?' cried the guard, backing the engine at once to the station with a determined air.

'I've had my revenge!' cried the stoker, in a hissing whisper, coming close to the guard, and speaking in his ear.

'Your revenge! upon whom? why, where's Luke Weston? Coles, you've murdered him.'

'I've had my revenge.'

'What's the matter with you, Coles? you've been drinking, confound you; you're drunk now, I do believe; we'll soon put you off this engine; what have you done with the body?'

Arthur trembled and shivered. 'I've had my revenge on him; Maggie Symons shall never walk to the wood again with him alone by moonlight.'

'You're cracked about that girl, Coles, and if you've murdered Luke, I can tell you I wouldn't like to stand in your shoes for a pretty penny. It will be a case of hanging, Coles; collect yourself, and prepare for the worst. What have you done with the body?'

The train was in the station by this time, and the facts became known with lightning speed. The blood and hair on the wheels of the engine revealed the truth which Arthur could not or would not tell, and he was detained in custody while an engine and carriage went to search for the dead body. They found a mangled corpse on the line; it was difficult to recognize in the crushed head and limbs the fine stalwart young engine

driver who had left Meryton in full health and spirits the previous evening, and whom the guard and some of the passengers had seen and spoken to at Atherley; but there was a sight more terrible still in the drunken madman his murderer, who muttered continually in one unbroken sentence, 'So! I've had my revenge on Luke Weston, and Maggie shall never walk with him to the wood again, alone in the moonlight.' Of course the guard was right; there was the gallows at the end of Arthur's career, and to that he would ere long arrive, for the law, though it licenses men to supply brain poison to the victims of a degraded appetite, does not shield these from the consequences of the dreadful acts to which they are tempted in their madness.

The news of the tragedy reached Maggie the same day that it happened. Coming in to supper, her father met her with a grave face, and told her of the dreadful occurrence, and that her name was on the murderer's lips.

'How well 'tis, father, that I never thought seriously of either of them poor

fellows! I should blame myself, but I never gave either of them any real reason to think I cared more for one than the other. Tom, did you ever hear of such a horrible affair?' and she turned to the young farmer who sat beside her at that evening meal, and with a few tears and sobs repeated the story to him.

In a few weeks more her hands and thoughts were busy preparing for her wedding; and if the ears of poor Arthur Coles had been acute enough, he might have heard on the day of his execution, just as the noose was round his neck, the bells of Meryton church, fifteen miles away, pealing forth merrily for the wedding of Thomas Prince, the well-to-do farmer, and beautiful Maggie Symons, and the sweet 'I will' was uttered before the altar just as the heavy thud of his descending body electrified the eager crowd. Stimulated by jealousy, wrought to frenzy by alcohol, he had lost for her his peace and life, and caused good, true-hearted Luke Weston's death, of whose unselfish love Maggie would never have been worthy.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

*Recent Discussions on the Abolition of Patents for Inventions in the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the Netherlands. Evidence, Speeches, and Papers in its Favour, with Suggestions as to International Arrangements regarding Inventions and Copyright.* Pp. 342. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

MR. MACFIE, M.P., makes a strong attack in this volume on the existing system of patents. He has collected speeches, papers, or other evidence, by Sir Wm. Armstrong, M. Benard, Count Bismark, M. Chevalier, M. Pock, M. Godefroi, Sir Roundell Palmer, the present Earl of Derby, James Stirling, Esq., and other authorities—in short, a mass of testimony, British or foreign, with comments from the daily and weekly newspapers; and he uses these and all other available ammunition, in order, as he says, to contribute to 'the emancipation of British productive industry from artificial restraints, which is the needful accompaniment and the complement of free trade, and in hope that public attention will now at length be turned towards procuring such a solution as will satisfy at the same time all

just pretensions of meritorious inventors and men of science.' The disadvantages of a patent system are obvious; what remains to be shown is, that invention would continue to be stimulated as much as it is now, if patents were abolished. The glittering dream of successful patentee wealth,—generally unrealised even by the most meritorious inventors, and only now and then coming true as in the case of an Arkwright, or a Bessemer, is yet sufficiently vivid to set invention on the rack, and to make men live laborious days and toil through long years of uncertainty, in the hope of being enabled to secure to themselves such brilliant financial results in the end as are only possible under a patent system. We have not been satisfied that the power of patenting could be dispensed with, without more loss in this respect than there would be gain in entire emancipation of manufacture and trade; nor does Mr. Macfie even yet convince us. But as a repertory of all that can be said on that side of the question which he so energetically and ably advocates, we commend this volume to the attention of our readers.

*National Sobriety Discussed in a Dialogue between a Publican, a Clergyman, and a Physician.* [By the Rev. Dawson Burns, A.M., Joint Author of the Temperance Bible Commentary. London: Alliance Offices, 28, King William-street.

With his customary acuteness and skill, Mr. Burns conducts in this fourteen page tract a conversation between the characters named in the title, and makes the contests which arise conducive to a sound temperance and prohibition conclusion.

*Onward: The Organ of the Band of Hope Movement.* Volume IV., 1868-9. Pp. 286. London: Tweedie. Manchester: Lancashire and Cheshire Band of Hope Union, 43, Market-street.

NICELY bound in cloth, this handsome volume contains all the numbers of 'Onward' for the last eighteen months. Prose articles, recitations, songs, hymns, and music form its various contents, and are of such a character as to justify and account for its popularity amongst conductors and members of Bands of Hope. A good photographic portrait of Mr. William Hoyle, Honorary Secretary of the Lancashire and Cheshire Band of Hope Union, and Author of Hymns, Songs, and Recitations for Bands of Hope, &c., forms an appropriate frontispiece to the volume.

*Methods of Teaching Arithmetic. A Lecture, addressed to the London Association of Schoolmistresses.* By J. G. Fitch, M.A., one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. London: E. Stanford, Charing Cross.

*The Science of Arithmetic: a Systematic Course of Numerical Reasoning and Computation. With very numerous Exercises.* By James Cornwell, Ph.D., and Joshua G. Fitch, M.A. Twelfth Edition.

*The School Arithmetic, formerly called Arithmetic for Beginners.* By James Cornwell, Ph.D., and Joshua Fitch, M.A. Tenth Edition. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

MR. FITCH lays much stress in his lecture on arithmetic the science, as distinguishing from arithmetic the art. The importance of arithmetic as an art has, he thinks, been commonly overvalued, and its value as a science insufficiently recognised. He holds that pupils, before entering upon a rule,

should be made to look well into the nature of the problem to be solved, and to join the teacher in the search for the right method of working it. He would have an illustrative example worked out before the pupil by the teacher solely with a view to the demonstration of the theory of the rule; in doing which, every axiom and general principle should be stated in plain language, so as to account for the reason of every step of the process. Nothing should ever be taken for granted. There being a reason for every step, that reason should be supplied. 'In life,' he says, 'sums are not presented to us in the shape of sums, nor in the concise language employed in school-books; but in questions of more or less complexity which require to be disentangled, resolved into their simpler elements, and translated, so to speak, out of the language of common life into the language of the arithmetic book. But then it is this kind of exercise of which pupils get too little in schools. The teacher is apt to do all this preliminary work of interpreting the question for them, and to be content, if after the sum is set down as a sum, it is correctly worked. Whereas it is this very work of thinking out the meaning of a sum and setting it down which is most difficult, and in the business of life most important.' Apart from the merely calculating value of arithmetic, Mr. Fitch pleads especially for its use as a scientific training for the mind; and he and his partner have constructed the arithmetics named above, holding this leading principle distinctly in mind all through. The patient fulness of explanation manifested in the larger work is remarkable, and seems to have commended it to a wide public already, as the title page bears on its face the words 'twelfth edition.' The smaller work of later issue, seems to be rapidly attaining to similar favour, not, we think, without sufficient reason.

*The Sunday-school World: an Encyclopædia of Facts and Principles, Illustrated by Anecdotes and Quotations from the Works of the Most Eminent Writers on Sunday-school Matters.* Edited by James Comper Gray. London: Elliot Stock.

THE intelligent and pains-taking author of 'Topics for Teachers,' 'The Class and the Desk,' and other similar publications, has projected another work, to

be completed in eighteen monthly parts, containing the sort of matter indicated in the title. It is designed to be a reference book for all who are connected in any way with the Sunday-school, to contain condensed and classified practical information and counsel on all matters concerning the Sunday-school and its work,—to be, in short, ‘a digest of all that is worthy of notice that has been written concerning the Sunday-school.’ A very copious index is promised.

*Is It True? A Protest Against the Employment of Fiction as a Channel of Christian Influence.* By the Rev. George Wm. Butter, M.A. London: W. Macintosh, 74, Paternoster Row.

Mr. BUTTER would burn up the best works of fiction without mercy. We do not at all sympathise with him in his headlong destructive zeal. There is fiction and fiction; the worst is bad in every way; but the best is a precious casket curiously wrought, and most eminently fitted to contain the priceless truth which is always within it.

*Lectures and Sermon.* By the Rev. T. Ashcroft, Parkgate, Rotherham. London: William Tweedie, 337, Strand.

A ‘PEEP’ into Mr. Ashcroft’s ‘Album’ reveals a series of ‘portraits of real life.’ The characters shown up are ‘John Sneeze,’ ‘James Smoke,’ ‘Timothy Sip,’ ‘Samuel Flirt,’ ‘Charles Soft,’ ‘Simon Sloth,’ and ‘Henry Start’—the last being the model youth, and the

others marked by faults or vices confessed in their names. The portraits are drawn with vigour and dash, and are both amusing and instructive. The sermon is entitled ‘Our Lads: A Plea for Sabbath Schools,’ and points out in earnest language sundry serious evils to which youths are exposed.

*Topics for Teachers: A New Work for Ministers, Sunday-school Teachers, and others, on an entirely new plan.* Monthly. By James Comper Gray, Halifax. Illustrated with over 200 Engravings and eight first-class Maps. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

*The Hive: A Storehouse of Material for Working Sunday-school Teachers.* Monthly. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

*Old Jonathan, the District and Parish Helper.* W. H. and L. Collingridge, 117 to 120, Aldersgate-street.

*The Scattered Nation.* Edited by C. Schwartz, D.D.—*The Church. A Penny Monthly Magazine. — The Appeal. A Magazine for the People.* London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

*The Lifeboat, or Journal of the National Lifeboat Institution.* Quarterly. 14, John-street, Adelphi, London.

*Seventeenth Annual Report of the Council of the City of Manchester on the Working of the Public Free Libraries.* Manchester: Tubbs and Brook.

## DISCONTINUANCE OF ‘MELIORA.’

THE Proprietors have decided that after the present number, completing the Volume, ‘Meliora’ shall be discontinued. Originated in 1858—one of the earliest of the low-priced magazines which have since then become so numerous—‘Meliora’ has, during eleven years, presented a large mass of valuable information on matters connected with social science to a considerable circle of readers, and whilst advocating the cause of prohibitory legislation, has extended the knowledge of the Alliance movement in quarters in which otherwise it might long have remained unknown. It is now felt that the time has come when service of this kind is no longer necessary. The economical, social, and moral calamities inevitably resulting from the liquor traffic are now acknowledged on every hand, and the existence and claims of the Alliance are a secret to none engaged in social or political reform. Literary organs like ‘Fraser,’ ‘The London Review,’ and other high-classed periodicals, as well as a large number of daily and weekly newspapers, are now from time to time putting before the public the facts and arguments on which the Alliance relies. Aid of this kind is sure to be rendered with increasing readiness now that the movement with such long strides is progressing in popular estimation. With hearty thanks, therefore, to all the friends who have so steadfastly supported this Review, we announce its discontinuance after the issue of this number.

